The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JULY 11, 1889.

The Week.

THE ballot law which has been enacted in Michigan is in many respects unlike any of those which have been put upon the statute-books of nine other States. It provides for exclusive State ballots of uniform size and color for general Congressional, State, and county elections, no other ballots to be legal. Each political party is to adopt a vignette to distinguish its ballots from those of other parties. Provision is made for a secret ballot by means of booths and a railing at each voting place. The inspectors are to place a rubber band around each ballot when it is deposited so as to detect when the votes are counted whether a voter deposits more than one ballot. There are careful provisions about counting the ballots so as to avoid any possibility of manipulating them. Severe fines and punishment are provided in case any one attempts to influence voters. These provisions are somewhat like those of the Milwaukee law which has worked so well in practice. The candidates' names are not grouped upon one ballot, as they are in the laws of the eight other States which have adopted that principle of the Australian system, but in other respects the law is in accordance with the Australian idea. An exclusive official ballot and absolute secrecy in voting are most important principles, for they do away with the worst evils of our politics. The effect of the Michigan law is likely to be the same as that of the Milwaukee law—to create a demand for its extension and amplification into the complete Australian method.

Only a few days before the Civil-Service Commission visited Milwaukee and made its report censuring Mr. Paul for disregarding the Civil-Service Law in making appointments, President Harrison removed the Collector of Internal Revenue at Milwaukee, Mr. Edward C. Wall, and appointed in his place Mr. Henry Fink. The letter which the President sent to Mr. Wall is as follows:

> EXECUTIVE MANSION, June 13, 1889.
> You are hereby removed from the office of Collector of Internal Revenue for the First District of Wisconsin, to take effect upon the appointment and qualification of your successor.
> BENJAMIN HARRISON.

It will be observed that the President assigned no reason for this act. We believe no one has ever been heard to question the fidelity or efficiency of Mr. Wall's administration of his office. That he was competent to discharge, and did in fact honestly discharge, every duty of his office is attested by all. Every dollar that was due the Government was economically collected and accounted for. Besides conducting the business of the office to the entire satisfaction of all, he had regard for the "spirit and purpose" of civil-service reform, and this, too, without the sanction of a law or the solemnity of a promise. The Commission, in reporting upon Postmaster Paul, do not charge him with having violated the law for political purposes. It would be gratifying if this could be said in extenuation of the President's removal of Mr. Wall.

Assistant Postmaster-General Clarkson has already appointed as postmaster in one town of this State a burglar, and in another a convicted keeper of a disorderly house, so that nobody will be surprised to learn that he has commissioned in an Arkansas town a man who had been convicted of sending obscene letters through the mails. Henry E. Sharpe was arraigned and convicted on this charge in the United States District Court at Springfield, Mo., in September, 1887, and, in default of the fine imposed, was sent to jail. Upon his release he removed to Lead Hill, Ark., and it was recently announced that Henry E. Sharpe had been appointed Postmaster at Lead Hill, Ark. Of course Mr. Clarkson will plead that he made the appointment, after his usual fashion, "not knowing the facts." It seems that Mr. Clarkson also does not know the laws which govern the appointment of postmasters. He recently appointed as Postmaster at Covington, La., a negro who was not merely objectionable on the score of character, but who was not a resident of the place. The Revised Statutes, section 3831, declare that "every postmaster shall reside within the delivery of the office to which appointed."

The Washington *Post* gives a scrap of conversation between a chief of a division and his Senator, which contains a moral for the spoilsmen as well as for the civil-service reformers. The chief had obtained his position through the influence of the Senator, and then, instead of being "true to his party" by making as many places as possible for the other boys less fortunate than himself, he actually gave the menaced subordinates his protection. When reproached by the Senator for this, he said: "I have worked all my life like a slave for a bare living. Now I have an easy place with a lot of subordinates who know all the details of the business, who will do all there is to be done and save me the bother. Now, if you think I am going to throw them out, and put in a lot of greenhorns, and then work myself to death learning the business and teaching them, you don't know me." Whether this conversation really took place or not does not matter. That there have been chiefs in abundance who acted upon the principles indicated in it, there is no question. The real chiefs, of course, were the poorly paid clerks "who knew all the details," and who worked with double vigor when they perceived that their retention largely depended upon their saving the chief all "the bother." This is rather expensive—having a real and a nominal chief in each of the many divisions in the Washington departments—but, at any rate, the work is done, and well done. It is the plan which we have urged should be generally adopted, namely, a paid officer, with no functions to perform, rewarded with the place and the pay because of his political services, and another non-political, permanent, every-day, hard-working servant getting his pay on the principle of *quantum meruit*. We doubt not that the self-indulgence of such chiefs as the Washington *Post* tells of will so disgust office-peddling Senators as to hasten the day when their friends will be given the pay, but not the opportunity to befriend and protect the underlings of the office.

The Supreme Court Justices of this State appear to hold varying views in regard to the interpretation of the law declaring that preference in employment must be given to honorably discharged soldiers. A few days ago we had the decision of Justice Andrews of this city, upon the attempt of Mr. Gilroy, the Commissioner of Public Works, to get rid of a soldier in his department by declining to assign work for him. The Justice decided that while Mr. Gilroy might legally decline to give the man work, he violated the law when he assigned his work to some other man, and issued a peremptory mandamus for the soldier's reinstatement. Two other Supreme Court Justices have made decisions recently which appear to be somewhat opposed to this. Justice Williams, presiding at Watertown, was asked to issue an order compelling the trustees of the village of Little Falls to appoint a certain man Village Attorney under the law giving preference to honorably discharged soldiers. He denied the application, on the ground that the applicant for the place must not only be an honorably discharged Union soldier, but also fit, competent, and of sufficient business capacity to perform the duties of the position. As to these qualifications it is the duty of the trustees to determine. Such determination, if judicial, cannot be reviewed, reversed, or directed by mandamus. Justice Putnam, presiding at Saratoga, denied a similar application in the interest of a man who desired to compel the trustees to appoint him Superintendent of Streets, holding that the law should be carried out faithfully, but declaring that he could not properly interfere with the reasonable discretion of the trustees if it appeared that they had exercised that discretion in good faith. He also declared that, once appointed, an incumbent could not be removed except for cause.

An amusing report was telegraphed from Maine on Saturday, that when Secretary Blaine passed through Bangor on Friday on his way to Bar Harbor, Congressman Boutelle studiously avoided meeting him. It is added that this is the first time that Mr. Boutelle ever allowed Mr. Blaine to pass through Bangor unnoticed by him, and that there is a coolness between the two statesmen arising over a disagreement upon the distribution of Maine patronage. There is something very droll in the idea of a coolness

LICENSED TO JNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

between Mr. Boutelle and the author of his political greatness, for if Mr. Blaine had not by main strength lifted him into politics and public life, he never would have been heard of outside of the State of Maine. Mr. Blaine did this service for him, as he has done it for many other men of similar calibre, because he wanted him for a personal agent in his own political schemes. First and last, Mr. Boutelle has been useful to him. He has sounded the praises of Mr. Blaine with great fluency and unction at all times and in all possible places for many years. In return for his efforts, Mr. Blaine had him elected to Congress, where he has simply emphasized by his conduct the great value of the service which his patron performed for him. That he should show coolness after all this is scarcely credible. The rumor must be a midsummer journalistic joke.

Mr. George O. Jones, who carries under his own hat almost the entire remains of the National Greenback party, has issued a call to himself to assemble in convention at Cincinnati on September 12. We do not know whether or not he has sent a copy of his call to Messrs. Randall and Dana, joint owners of the high-tariff-and-trust Democratic party, but he ought by all means to do so. They could "get together" with him, and thus they as well as he would be assured of a convention from 50 to 200 per cent. larger than would otherwise be possible. Father McGlynn and Gen. Butler, if approached in the proper manner, might also be induced to join, and a nucleus would thus be formed for a movement which might possibly attract a sufficient number of the disappointed and hungry of all parties to make it worth while for the National Committee of one or the other of the great parties to "buy it up" in 1892. It is very evident now that unless the rag-tag and bob-tail of politics do "get together" in this or some other way, none of them will be of sufficient consequence to "strike" a National Committee successfully three years hence.

The news comes from the South of the killing by "Dan" Alston of a quiet and law-abiding Scotchman, named Wilson, who, with many of his countrymen, has been for several years developing the stone resources of Lithonia, Ga. "Dan" Alston is the son, the only surviving son, of that Robert A. Alston who was killed about ten years ago in the Capitol building of Georgia by "Ed" Cox. Cox was found guilty of murder, but the jury recommended him to the mercy of the court, and the judge, under this recommendation—a piece of legislation of which Alston himself was the author—sentenced him to the penitentiary, or, more accurately speaking, to the chain-gang, for life. When Gov. Alexander Stephens subsequently pardoned Cox, the only man in Georgia, perhaps in the South, who had ever been subjected to really severe punishment for killing in a perfectly "gentlemanly" manner another man, was permitted to go free. "Dan" Alston, who was by nature rough and wayward, thus lost while yet a mere boy a father whose courage was devoid of all bravado, and whose bearing was high and honorable. In short, he lost the one person who could have managed him and who would have civilized him. Since that tragedy, "Dan" has run wild. He has lived among those who have perpetually reminded him that no Alston has yet died except in his boots. The ruffianly part of him has become each year more prominent. "Ed" Cox has had every reason to believe that "Dan" Alston was to be feared, for there have been many, it is said, to hint to the latter what he owed to the memory of his father. And now we see the product of this kind of education: "Dan" Alston, the rowdy, celebrating the Fourth of July in cowboy style, interfering with social reunions, disturbing the peace, breaking beer bottles over the heads of those who sought to eject him from their premises, and finally killing a respectable citizen who sternly rebuked him for his "dirty tricks."

The Buffalo *Commercial*, while approving of our recent comments on the McDow murder trial, thinks that there are too many miscarriages of justice in the North, and too many cases where the acquittal of assassins has been marked by the applause of men and women, to warrant us in visiting severe condemnation upon South Carolina society in this instance. If this had been a mere miscarriage of justice, the *Commercial's* caveat would be entirely proper, but it was nothing of the sort. It was the regular course of things in the South, as everybody knows. The prevailing idea is that the gallows and the State prison were never intended for gentlemen, because they never kill each other without strong provocation. A crucial test of the strength of this sentiment was furnished in Kentucky a few years ago, when a defeated suitor shot and killed the Chief Justice of the State for deciding against him in a case involving the title to land. It was something of a struggle to get this fellow clear, and it was even necessary to confine him a short time in a madhouse. But the underlying maxims and principles instilled and cultivated by the institution of slavery asserted their dominant force, and this cold-blooded murderer was finally acquitted. Can our Buffalo contemporary imagine a case in which killing, by a person in good society, and unconnected with robbery, would be punished by death at the hands of a jury? If no such case can be imagined, then the acquittal of McDow was not a miscarriage of justice, but a part of the normal social movement in South Carolina. That there are many good people in Charleston and in all parts of the South who deplore the verdict in the McDow case, and would have voted the other way if they had been on the jury, we have no doubt, but they are not sufficiently numerous to constitute society. If they were, we should have verdicts of a different kind.

There are some thousands of males in the country entitled to vote who would rather be the victor in Monday's prize-fight than be President of the United States. In fact, the honors of the Presidency are of small concern in their view compared with those that adorn the brow of John L. Sullivan. Of course every exhibition of this kind, where the fighting is real and not sham, and where money is staked on the result, makes an appetite for more. Yet there has been a sensible decline in the public interest in these brutal displays since the great Heenan-Sayers fight, which enlisted the attention of statesmen in England and of society in both countries. Although crowds went to the bulletin-boards on Monday evening, they were small as compared with those who struggled for the first news of that greater battle. Although Boston "went wild" on Monday, it was a lower Boston than that which bought the "extras" which told how Sayers was knocked around the ring like a wooden image, receiving little more harm than a billet of hickory under like treatment, until finally he closed both of Heenan's eyes and finished him off. The interest in the Sullivan-Kilrain engagement ran in a lower stratum decidedly. It is not to be supposed that any match, national or international, would now engage the thoughts of educated persons, unless the battle were fought in their immediate neighborhood. Moreover, it is quite certain that no such efforts would have been made by the public authorities in the South a quarter of a century ago, to prevent the fight, as were made by the Governor of Mississippi. He seems to have done his whole duty. If the Sheriff of Marion County disobeyed his orders, it is to be hoped that he will be punished according to the measure of the law.

The Minister of Persia to the United States is a victim of one of the most pernicious habits of our time—that of reading newspapers. By excessive indulgence in this practice he has lost his situation as Minister. The consequences are somewhat serious, or would be such if all Persians were addicted to the habit in the same degree. Not only is Mr. Hodji Hossein Ghooly afflicted in the manner described, but he furnishes matter for the newspapers also, having contributed a half-column interview to a Washington interviewer on the Fourth of July. Mr. Ghooly's bad practices do not end even here. He collects all the unpleasant things he finds in the newspapers and puts them in a scrap-book, so that he can refresh his grief if he finds himself at any time getting into a cheerful mood. Pointing to his scrap-book, "I tell you," he said, "that I cannot bear all these things to be said about my King, who in his heart has the kindness to favor the American Minister and all the American citizens in Persia. When I arrived in this country, I came by way of New York. I saw there the statue of Liberty Enlightening the World. I was glad, and I thought, 'Here one can live always without trouble or annoyance.' Now, after being here nine months, I go away as fast as I can, and like a prisoner escaping from his prison. For this purpose and to say these things I re-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sign my position as Minister from Persia, and speak as a private citizen of that country. As a Persian Minister I could not say this." The only cure for the evils described by Mr. Ghooly, and they are undoubtedly great, is to break off his bad habits gradually, if need be. He should first give up his scrap-books at whatever cost, and then limit himself to a certain number of newspapers per day, reducing the allowance according to some fixed rule. He might in the end conquer the habit entirely, but if he should not succeed so far, he would certainly be on the road to self-control. If any word from us could reach his master, the Shah, we should advise him to choose his next American minister by competitive examination in languages, the highest mark being given to those who cannot read at all, the next highest to those who can only read Persian. All who can read American newspapers with facility should be barred out.

A correspondent asks us whether it is true, as stated by Col. T. W. Higginson in a recent letter in these columns, that the Government administers a railroad when it is in the hands of a receiver. The answer is that the Government does administer the railroad, but not in the sense that Col. Higginson implied. He meant to say that if the Government could administer a railroad through a receiver, the presumption would be that it could take up railroad administration as a branch of its regular functions—not that it ought to, but that it could do so fairly well. Col. Higginson overlooks the fact that administration by receivership is really administration by opposing claimants of the property under the umpirage of the court. In the first place, if the claimants can agree upon a receiver, the person they agree upon is always chosen. If they cannot agree, the judge chooses one and puts him in charge, subject to the criticism of all the claimants. Then every order and every act of the receiver is open to review and argument at all times, in term-time and in vacation, by the parties in interest, no matter how small the interest. To establish the parallelism that Col. Higginson suggests, we must imagine all the railroads in the country operated by umpires who are bound to hear arguments from private persons whenever a new locomotive or a ton of steel rails is wanted or a bridge needs repairing.

The report made by Maj. Marindin to the Board of Trade concerning the introduction of the electric light into London seems to be of a very instructive character. It is proposed to divide the territory into districts, and to apportion them among a number of companies in such a way that only two companies shall lay their wires in any district. In order to provide facilities for operating motors, only one of these companies is to use the alternating current. A maximum charge for light is fixed at the outset, subject to revision at the end of seven years, and after forty-two years the local authority will have the right to terminate the concession and buy the property of the company. It is further provided that, after a 10 per cent. dividend has been paid, a portion of the profits shall be applied to reducing prices. While this scheme apparently extinguishes competition, our experience in this country shows that this may not be so objectionable as it sounds. As Stephenson said long ago, where combination is possible, competition is impossible; and lighting companies can always combine. As the expense to consumers is never permanently lessened by such competition as takes place, it seems wise upon the whole to recognize the teachings of experience, and at least prevent the streets from being dug up a number of times when once should suffice. The interests of the consumer should be protected when the concession is granted, as they seem to be by this plan. Its operation will be watched with interest from this side of the Atlantic.

A new process for the production of white lead from lead ore has been brought out in England, which may possibly deliver the American public from the tender mercies of the Lead Trust. The process follows, in the main, the Bessemer process of making steel, the oxidation being produced by air instead of acids. The process is not poisonous to workmen, as the old acid process is, and the product is said to be better as well as cheaper. There are two ways by which the American people can avoid getting the benefit of this discovery. One is for the Trust to absorb the new invention, and the other is to increase the duty on white lead so as to "equalize the conditions of production." The present duty on white lead is three cents per pound. If the new process lowers the cost three cents per pound, we can easily meet that difficulty by doubling the duty, and this would be the most obvious course to follow if Mr. Hanney, the inventor, should be unreasonable in his demands for the use of his invention. The precedents are in favor of the latter course, for when Mr. Siemens of Berlin invented a new and cheaper method of making glass bottles, and offered it to the American manufacturers, they refused to take it, but went to Congress and got the duty on bottles raised to a figure sufficient to neutralize Mr. Siemens's discovery. This was much cheaper than paying Siemens for his invention.

Vague notices have reached this country of the treaty negotiated between several South American Powers, to establish an international law of procedure in civil cases. This treaty was signed at Montevideo January 11, and its text has now been published. The countries taking part in the conference for the discussion and settling of its terms were Paraguay, Uruguay, the Argentine Republic, Chili, Brazil, Bolivia, and Peru. The great aim was to secure uniformity of law touching the innumerable and vexing cases of commercial litigation arising between citizens of different countries. While it has not been possible to secure this entirely, yet much has been gained by the final agreement in which the delegates from all the Powers united. The contracting States bind themselves to recognize the legal processes of each other, and to recognize and enforce, each within its own limits, decisions made in the courts of any of the others affecting its own citizens. The establishment of boards of arbitration, in certain cases, is also provided for, and their decisions, when arrived at under conditions named, are to be held as binding by all the States. All this marks a great advance in the simplification of the business relations of the merchants of these various countries. It indicates, also, decided progress in the appreciation and adoption of civilized methods of settling international controversies on the part of Governments which we have been too much accustomed to regard as barbarous. The Pan-American Congress at Washington next October will be a much more pretentious affair, but it may well be doubted if, at the end of all the palaver, so definite and valuable a document as this of the Montevideo conference will get the signatures of all the delegates.

The concern of the French Government at the preference shown by French emigrants for the countries of South America over the colonies of France finds its latest expression in a letter of M. Étienne, Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, to the President of the Chamber of Commerce of Paris. The object of the letter is to show the great opening for laboring men in some of the French colonies, New Caledonia for example, and to express an opinion as to the best means to be employed to turn the tide of French emigration away from lands of alien speech and institutions to the new settlements which France is pushing in various parts of the world. M. Étienne thinks that France must learn from other countries: if they provide free passage for the emigrant, so must she; if they guarantee him wages and tools and a sure location, so must she. He admits that the right of the State thus to act has not yet been clearly fixed; it is one of the questions to be referred to an International Congress at the Exposition. But it is clear to his mind that, unless France warns intending emigrants against the deceptive statements made by the agents of other governments, and bestirs herself in pointing out desirable locations in her colonies and giving needful aid in reaching such points and in becoming established there, she will fail to see many of her sons going to those "national sheep-folds," as he calls them. It is evident, however, that it is something more than ignorance that leads French emigrants to shun French colonies. To go to them would be their obvious course, and they must have good reasons for adopting another. What the reasons are may be inferred, at least in part, from a letter which the *Temps* recently published from a French colonist. He represents the new community as prosperous enough if only it could be let alone; but it is weighted by French officialism, so that "when we earn four sous, the local government takes from us at least three and a half."

LICENSED TO GALE/ORO
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OUR DIPLOMACY.

ALL of our countrymen ought to welcome heartily an exposition of the needs of our diplomacy by one who has been the diplomatic agent of their Government at London during four years, and especially by one who achieved such well-earned eminence in the office as did Mr. Phelps. In his recent utterances before the Harvard Phi Beta Kappa Society he said, "The time has come when we need to have established a distinctive, definite, wise, grand, and, above all, a consistent American policy in our international relations." It is not to be inferred that he intended to imply that heretofore the United States has not had such a policy, as consistent as changing circumstances would permit. Heretofore it has been the rule among us, fairly well observed, that party politics ceased at the ocean's edge. When the President is of one party, and a majority of the Senate is of an opposite party, there is naturally a tendency on the part of the Senate to hamper the President in the conduct of foreign affairs, or rather to postpone action on matters which can be postponed, in the hope that the next turn of the wheel will give the Presidency to the party which has the Senate. And foreign governments are quick to discern and take advantage of a conflict of opinion and purpose between the President and the Senate, and to yield when they discover concert of purpose between all the branches of our Government. Mr. Phelps indicates his appreciation of this fact in the following sentence:

"Changing hands so often as our Government does, we can have nothing worthy the name of a foreign policy, nothing that will either be respected abroad or effectual for its purpose, unless by the establishment of principles, of traditions, of modes of procedure such as shall stand the test of experience and the criticism of mankind, and that shall pass on unimpaired from Administration to Administration, from party to party, the common property of all, the inheritance of each from its predecessor."

But the establishment of what principles, traditions, and modes of procedure would, or could, have relieved the friction of the last four years between the State Department and the Senate in regard to the Extradition Treaty and the fisheries? The country was hampered by the hostile purposes of the President and Senate, which, of course, impaired our diplomacy. Every one will say that our foreign policy during the last four years should have been founded "on the highest morality and justice," but the impediment came of divergence in that regard between the two independent Powers to whom the Constitution had committed the making of treaties. Mr. Phelps adds:

"It is idle to expect that a foreign policy of this kind—kind, elevated, just, consistent, and resolute—can be maintained by our country unless the subject can be withdrawn from the field of party politics. That the contests of the party must continue is inevitable. They are the curse of free government, but are a part of the price of it. In questions between other nations and our own in measures that involve not the success of the party, but the interests and honor of the whole country, we should present the same united front in the controversies of peace as in those of war, and give a generous support to the Administration, of whatever politics, that is charged for the time being with the support of the common cause."

Is not that ideal politics? Can it be seen in England, or anywhere else, under representative institutions and universal suffrage? Indeed, could Mr. Phelps, if he were a Senator, avoid voting with his party friends, if, for example, a new fishery arrangement were sent to the Senate by Secretary Blaine? Is it not true that, when the President and a majority of the Senate are of opposing views in party matters, the office of President calls for the very highest and best sort of diplomatic work to bring about a *modus vivendi* between opposing leaders in the Senate, and to help along the purposes of the Department of State?

But we began our references to the suggestive views expressed by Mr. Phelps at Harvard in order to invite attention to what he tells us is needed to enforce our "*policy*" on foreign governments *after* it has been formulated in Washington—which formulating by the President and the Senate seems to us to be, as we have indicated, the critical part of the business. Mr. Phelps said that

"to enforce such a policy, a navy should be created that would leave nothing to fear from any other naval Power. Naval strength, he remarked by way of an epigram, is the right arm of diplomacy, and if necessary he would wipe out the surplus in the construction of a suitable navy, and would build strong coast fortifications. He also advocated the sending of an ambassador to each of the first-class Powers instead of a minister plenipotentiary. The American representative in the great capitals of Europe should not only have his proper rank among his diplomatic colleagues, but he should be provided with an official residence becoming the dignity of his country. Our representative should likewise be provided with a sufficient pecuniary allowance to enable him to maintain with credit the position in which he is placed and return suitably the hospitalities he cannot decline."

What Mr. Phelps advocates is a raising of the titular rank of our diplomatic agents at the great European capitals; an increase of their salaries; an appropriation of money to be expended by them in social hospitality; the purchase and maintenance for them of a house for an official residence. We are quite certain that Mr. Phelps will agree that if such things should be done for our diplomatic agents abroad, they should be (excepting increase of titular rank) done at home for our Vice-President, our Supreme Court judges, and the heads of departments. He has also meditated, no doubt, on the question whether or not our State Department, or, indeed, our Government at Washington, is now equipped to deal satisfactorily with the ceremonies and formalities which must come if we send, and then, of course, receive ambassadors as ours will be received at Berlin, St. Petersburg, Vienna, Madrid, and possibly at Paris and London? Really, would the increased rank and salary, an official residence, and the allowance of an entertaining fund, have given an iota of added power to the pen or tongue of Mr. Phelps in his contention with the British Foreign Office in the fishery matter? The country should be glad to listen to Mr. Phelps whenever he has a fitting opportunity to consider that question.

But what Mr. Phelps says of the need of a great navy, in addition to increased rank and salary, as the "right arm" of our ambassadors, is most important of all. He defines "a suitable navy" as one that "would leave nothing to fear from any other naval Power." To that end he would "wipe out the surplus." Those opinions, coming from such a source, cannot be put aside as inconsequential. They will receive cordial approbation from the political leaders and party workers now in the ascendancy at the White House and in Congress. The building of a great navy is already on their cards. They have a quick eye for all that such a building implies in the way of expenditure and employment of "workers." But, quite apart from all that, has any foreign government ever, from 1778 at Paris to 1889 at Berlin, and in our most successful foreign diplomacy, yielded anything to us on account of fear of our naval thunder? Is it worth while now to increase our taxes merely and solely in order to build a great navy to be the "right arm" of our ambassadors, and to rival the colossal naval equipments of England, Germany, and France? Did the recent success (as represented) of our Samoan diplomacy at Berlin depend at all on our navy, or even on the rank or salary of our diplomatic representatives? Would our success have been a whit greater if we had possessed the whole navy of Great Britain, and had been represented by three dignitaries each equal in rank to a mandarin of the red button?

"*PROTECTION*" *FOR ARTISTS.*

No one doubts that a protective tariff, whether or not it be a good thing for the country at large, is a very good thing for the protected manufacturers themselves. No one doubts that Mr. Carnegie, for instance, finds his interest in the duties upon iron. Yet there is a body of producers engaged in a single "industry" in this country who are almost unanimous in their opposition to a duty imposed, presumably, for their benefit, who have repeatedly protested against its continuance and petitioned for its removal, and who have recently formed a national organization solely for the purpose of procuring its abolition. These producers are the artists of the United States, and this organization is the National Free Art League.

Are we to believe that these men are actuated altogether by altruistic motives, and are so raised above common humanity that they are indifferent to the appeals of self-interest? It seems to us more probable that they are as human as their neighbors, and that if they do not desire "protection" for the industry they are engaged in, it is because they are convinced that their interest does not lie that way, and that, in their own case at least, protection does not protect. Let us see, then, what they have to say for themselves, and why it is that they are found in the unique position of a body of men protesting almost unanimously against a tax levied for their own benefit.

In the circular issued by the National Free Art League may be found the following sentences:

"The present tariff upon works of art *is not in the nature of a protective tax*. The price of a work of art depends upon the individual reputation of the artist, and a cause which enhances the price of foreign works of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

art *has no beneficial effect* upon domestic production."

This is the gist of the whole matter. The artists who are enrolling themselves as members of the League are not self-sacrificing heroes, bent upon immolating themselves for the public good; they are not, as a body, free-traders or even revenue-reformers. Many of them are as good protectionists as Mr. Carnegie himself. They are simply men who believe that in their own trade, owing to peculiar differences between it and other industries, protection is not a benefit. A man is presumed to be the best judge of his own interest, and the reasons the artists give for their belief are therefore worth some examination.

"The price of a work of art depends upon the individual reputation of the artist." There is no such thing as a market price for pictures. At the same sale a picture by Millet may bring many thousands, while a picture by some little-known American sells for as many dollars. The big price is not given because the picture is larger or handsomer or better, but because it is painted by Millet. We must have coats and shoes and steel rails, and if we cannot, for any reason, get them from one manufacturer, we must get them from another, but we can do quite well without pictures, and if we cannot afford Millet's or Meissonier's, we do not therefore buy Jones's or Robinson's. Jones's pictures or Robinson's pictures are not the same thing and do not supply the same want. If we want a picture by Meissonier, and cannot afford to buy it, we go without, but we do not buy a picture by some American artist instead. The essence of the marketable value of a picture is that it is unlike all others and that *the same thing* cannot be produced. A copy might, doubtless, be made of Millet's "Angelus" so closely resembling the original that it would deceive good judges; but it would not *be* the original, and its value in the market—unless it were fraudulently sold for the original—would be insignificant. Nay, even in the case of a replica by the master's own hand, the second picture would be worth less than the first, while the value of both would be lessened by the fact that there were two of them. The fact is that, commercially speaking, there is no such thing as "a picture"—there is only this or that particular picture by this or that particular artist. You cannot tax a picture, as such, and thereby raise the price of all pictures; you can only tax a particular picture, and thereby raise the price of *that* picture or of other pictures by the same hand. The only person you can possibly benefit directly by levying a 30 per cent. duty on pictures by Corot is the American manufacturer of Corots; and as, if such a manufacturer exists, his whole trade is forgery, he is not a person we need be concerned to protect. The honorable American artist who is not engaged in producing fraudulent Corots, but in painting genuine Smiths or Browns, has gained nothing, and he knows it. The enhanced price of Corots has not raised one penny the price of Smiths, and, *the difference in price between a Smith and a Corot having been increased*, he finds himself, in popular opinion, marked more clearly than before as an inferior artist. The same self-interest that prompts the wool-grower or the iron-manufacturer to desire an increase of the tariff leads him necessarily to demand its abolition.

Strangely enough, while our artists thus find themselves opposing the continuance of the tariff upon works of art, some of the dealers in foreign art works are on the other side. We said above that the only person directly benefited by this tariff was the forger of imitation foreign pictures, but there is an indirect benefit to the dealer in genuine foreign pictures also. The ordinary picture-buyer knows little of the artistic merit of a painting, and the dealer can always point to the fact that he has found it worth his while to pay a 30 per cent. duty upon it as proof positive of the superiority of the foreign work over that of domestic production. In many cases he deducts the duty from the buying price, while he adds it to the selling price, thus receiving twice what he pays once, and making the price of the veriest daub respectable enough to seem a guarantee of merit to the uninstructed buyer. The present ad-valorem duty of 30 per cent. encourages rather than discourages the importation of the cheaper products of foreign studios, and only tends to keep out those better works that every true artist would wish to see imported in greater numbers. It swells the profits of picture-dealers without benefiting either our own or foreign artists, while it increases the cost of works of art to the purchaser. Is it any wonder that the artists of this country find that protection does not protect *them*, and that they energetically protest against being "protected" in this way?

The Republican party now has control of the Government in all its branches. It is committed to the doctrine of protection, and cannot reduce the duties on manufactures without alienating the influence of the protected industries. Yet there is the surplus. Why not reduce it by taking off the only tax of them all "the abolition of which," to quote the League's circular again, "is not only not objected to, but is demanded, by the class sought to be protected, the artists of America"?

THE SUGAR DUTIES.

THE Boston *Advertiser* has a leading article entitled "A Calm View of the Sugar Situation." There is danger, it thinks, lest passion and prejudice should get the upper hand and cause serious injury to one of the most important business interests in Boston. It is glad to observe that the Sugar Trust "is making some concessions to public sentiment," by charging a little less for refined sugar than the tariff allows. It would prefer that there were no such thing as a Sugar Trust, but it cannot sympathize with those who would like to see the refining business "destroyed" simply because it is controlled by a Trust. Accordingly it opposes the plan of the Boston *Herald* to make the duty on sugar uniform at two cents per pound, and recommends instead that raw sugar be put on the free list, and that the duty on refined be fixed at one-half cent per pound. While making this recommendation, it says that "the Sugar Trust needs no especial protection." A duty of one-half cent per pound would amount to a bonus of $15,000,000 per year to the refiners on the present consumption of the country—or say, 3,000,000,000 pounds. This, in the judgment of the *Advertiser*, is not "especial protection."

If the Trust has made some concessions by charging a little less than the tariff allows, that result is due to the fact that a high price curtails the demand. The advance in raw sugars, not the conscience of the Trust, has cut down in some small measure the profits of the refiners. Conscience has nothing to do with prices anyway, in sugar or in anything. With or without Trusts, the price of an article is what the law of supply and demand establishes. Society would be in perpetual turmoil if we were in the habit of expecting the producers of goods to abate their charges as a matter of kindness and hospitality. When the price of raw sugar falls to its former level, the Trust will pocket the whole of the margin between raw and refined as fixed in the tariff, and ought to. If they have anything to give away, they will give it as other charitably disposed persons do, like Mr. Andrew Carnegie, for example. The country has voted this margin to them, and there is not the slightest reason why they should not pocket it.

The margin is between 1¼ and 1½ cent per pound, depending upon the grade and quality of the sugars imported. The bulk of the sugar which came in last year tested between 92° and 96°. The duty on each hundred pounds of raw testing 92° is $2.08. The duty on the same quantity of refined is $3.50. The margin of protection is the difference between these figures, viz., $1.42. At 96° the duty on raw is $2.24 and the margin of protection is $1.26. This is what the law doth give. If the refiners take any less, they must do so either because the maximum price lessens the demand, or because they see in the public impatience, which the Boston *Advertiser* deprecates, a threatened repeal or reduction of the discriminating duty.

It is not likely that the latter consideration enters into their business arrangements at all. They may have it in view as a theorem or abstract conception, like a future state of existence, but they would be very foolish to give up a present profit for a future uncertainty. What Congress may do is doubtful. Among the things least likely to have weight would be a plea that the Trust had been, on the whole, generous, and had not taken all that it might have taken. To any Congressman who wanted to repeal the duty, such a plea would be a laughing-stock. To any one who wanted to adhere to the Chicago platform, the difference between a cent and a cent and a half in the margin of protection would be perfectly immaterial. Any good business man—and the Sugar Trust is certainly composed of such—would prefer to make hay while the sun shines, taking his chances of the rainy day hereafter.

The significance of the *Advertiser's* article

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lies in the fact that one of the deafest protectionist newspapers in the country has heard that there is thunder somewhere around the horizon. Others had heard it before. The proposition to reduce the tax for the benefit of the monopoly to about $15,000,000 per year is an encouraging symptom. How it is to be reconciled with the Republican national platform, which demands the repeal of the whiskey tax rather than the reduction of any protective duties whatsoever, we leave to the *Advertiser* and others like minded to explain. We do not think, however, that any half-measures will be adopted with reference to the Trust. To cut down the margin between raw and refined to half a cent per pound would call attention to the fact that the Trust has its fingers in every sugar-bowl in the country, and that the half cent is a sheer gratuity differing from the present tax only in amount. The Boston *Herald's* proposal to make a uniform duty on all sugars is much more reasonable, but the duty ought not to exceed one cent per pound. At this rate the tax would yield nearly $30,000,000, and this is quite sufficient to be imposed upon an article of food used by all classes and conditions of people, and paid chiefly by those in humble circumstances, because they are the most numerous body of consumers. The *Advertiser's* glib assumption that the sugar-refining industry would be "destroyed" if the protection were taken away, calls to mind the similar pretence of the quinine manufacturers when theirs was repealed. "The boy lied."

THE PRICE OF LIBERTY.

In the *Popular Science Monthly* for July, Prof. Sumner gives a severe shaking to the various isms whose aim is that some men shall live at the expense of others, viz., anarchism, socialism, nationalism, State absolutism, and compulsory altruism. All these things require that personal liberty shall be first overturned, because under the régime of liberty each man is charged with his own support. The right to pursue happiness is conjoined with the necessity of using one's powers with intelligence and industry. Society can go back to servitude, from which it has, after much pain and struggle, emerged, but it cannot have liberty and servitude at the same time. If there are such things as natural rights and equal rights, they are incompatible with a system which requires one man to support another against his will, whether the system be called socialism or feudalism.

There is perhaps no phrase that stands more in need of definition and defence than that of "natural rights." It is made to do a great deal of service on the stump, in Congress, and in the press, by persons who have never asked themselves what are the rights that nature has conferred upon man. To answer this question it is necessary to observe what rights men in the state of nature enjoy and what they have enjoyed in the past. When we enter upon such an inquiry, we find that they are not the rights which we mean when we use the phrase natural rights. Among Australian savages, these being by common consent nearest to the state of nature of all existing tribes, the right of a young woman is to be brained with a club if she does not follow the man who first takes a fancy to her. Among Terra del Fuegians the right of an aged person is to be eaten instead of the more useful dogs of the family. In general the right of the strong man in the state of nature is to take the weaker man's property, his wife, his life, or his liberty. The right of the weaker man is to submit.

The state of nature is the last place to search for "natural rights." Least of all is it the place to look for the right to liberty, a right which was denied even in our own country down to the year 1865. If there is any one thing in the world's history that denies and stultifies the right to liberty as being "natural," it is the almost universal prevalence of slavery, and its persistence down to our own time, even among the most highly civilized races. The republics of Greece in their palmy days enslaved each other's free citizens with no more compunction than Tippo Tib feels in his present operations in Central Africa. Our ancestors in Massachusetts thought it not wrong to sell the children of Quakers into slavery, and they made no distinction between Indians and Africans in that regard, as, indeed, there was no reason why they should. The *natural* right of a prisoner of war is to be killed or made a slave of. The right to life and the right to liberty, as they now exist, are artificial and conventional rights evolved from the painful experience of ages. Such they are historically, and no man can affirm that they are different in any other sense, except by taking refuge in theological dogmas which have no more foundation in the Bible than they have in the natural state of man.

What are commonly called natural rights are ideal rights, the product of ideas gradually accepted by mankind and moulded into the form of law. "The most important fact in regard to the history of the dogma of natural liberty," says Prof. Sumner, "is that *that dogma never had an historical foundation*, but is the purest example that could be brought forward of an out-and-out *à-priori* dogma; that this dogma, among the most favored nations, helped and sustained the emancipation of the masses; and that by contagion it has, in the nineteenth century, spread liberty to the uttermost parts of the earth." By dint of calling these rights natural when they are in the strictest sense artificial, having been forged by the sweat of ages, minds have been opened to believe that a lot of other things follow as corollaries, such as the right to a living, the right to labor (*i. e.*, the right to be provided with suitable employment), and the right to marry (*i. e.*, the right to have one's offspring taken care of). These things are inseparable from the right to pursue happiness, and if this be a natural right, the others cannot be denied. If it is only an artificial right, hammered out by painful effort, the others are in like manner to be won by toil and patient mastery of the conditions in which man's lot has been cast on earth.

The right to liberty having been gained by slow effort, protracted certainly through the whole historic period of the race, the presumptions are mightily in favor of its being beneficial, of its being something worth clinging to at all hazards—as is the common understanding of all who enjoy it. Those who advocate Government control of the means of existence, generally speak of it as a larger liberty than is now vouchsafed to any people, since it offers, in their opinion, opportunities for the enjoyment of life, and freedom from anxiety, to larger numbers of human beings. The common answer—and it is a true one—is that such opportunities for enjoyment, and such deliverance from anxiety, are won only by labor conjoined with intelligence, and that the question at bottom is whether governments can direct the labor of men more intelligently than they can direct it themselves, supposing for the moment that all are as willing to work for common ends as for their own ends. "But you must," says the socialist, the nationalist, the compelling altruist. Ah, then you begin by subverting liberty. Your first step is to overthrow and bring to naught something which your fathers and grandfathers wrought out with great effort and shed their blood that you might enjoy, and which, in a general way, you hold to be your most valuable earthly possession. More than ever does it seem true that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance.

COLOR PREJUDICE.

The recent appointments of black men as postmasters in some Southern towns where nearly all the mail matter is sent and received by white people, have aroused much local criticism, which in turn has provoked no little comment in the Northern press. In one case, at Covington, La., a negro was appointed who had never been a resident, who was unknown to the people of the town, and against whose character charges were made. But the most conspicuous case has been that of the office at Bay St. Louis, a summer resort for well-to do people of New Orleans, of which it is really a suburb. Here a negro was appointed Postmaster whose character is conceded to be good, but whose selection is complained of solely on account of his color. The men of the families being generally absent in the city during the day-time, the postal business is done almost exclusively by the women and children, and the local press complains that it is disagreeable for these white women and children to find a black man in control of the office.

When such complaints by the local papers reached the North, a number of the Republican organs were moved to expressions of the most violent indignation. "An insane prejudice," it was called by a Massachusetts paper, while the loud-mouthed Boutelle declared, in his Bangor *Whig and Courier*, that "this is simply monstrous." Why white people at a summer resort in Louisiana should object to taking their letters and buying their stamps from a black postmaster, was something which these New England people professed to believe past their

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

comprehension. "Why should a good colored man be offensive as a postmaster?" asked Boutelle, with the air of a man who knew that nobody living could answer his question. In the same line were the remarks of Assistant Postmaster-General Clarkson, who is quoted as having talked in this way to one party of protesting Southerners: "Does not a colored servant cook your meal, another wait on your table, another shave your face, and still another mix your toddy for you? You admit that. Well, then, I'm unable to see why it is that if you can take your breakfasts from black hands, you can't also take your letters and newspapers from the hands of negro postmasters. At the office in question, Senator, a colored man will be appointed before night."

There is, however, nothing extraordinary about this particular manifestation of the color prejudice. There are other exhibitions of the same feeling, North as well as South, which are even more remarkable. A newspaper conducted by colored men has recently been calling attention to the fact that the dry-goods merchants of Boston will not employ black men and women as clerks, salesmen, and saleswomen, no matter how deserving the applicants, simply because they are black. Another newspaper conducted by colored men mentions an incident which illustrates the fact that color prejudice is sometimes stronger among Northern men than among Southern. A correspondent of this journal who visited Knoxville, Tenn., not long ago, and observed the many large buildings in course of erection, was struck by the entire absence of negro mechanics. Knowing that many of the best houses in the city had been built by negro mechanics, and that less than twenty years ago but few white mechanics were employed, he asked a citizen the reason. "He told me that white mechanics had been imported from the North, and that they refused to work with negroes. The result was that the negro mechanic could not be employed." This is not an exceptional case. It would be hard to find a white man in the North who would consent to serve under a negro foreman, but such a sight is by no means uncommon in Southern cities.

Occasionally somebody like George W. Cable comes forward with a sad tale of color prejudice in the South—perhaps a lamentation that in Atlanta, Ga., the most refined and educated negro can only go to the theatre on condition of sitting in the gallery. But the same thing is true to this day in the city of Brooklyn. Even black members of the Grand Army of the Republic in that "City of Churches" are forbidden the privilege of sitting beside their white comrades in the body of the house at an entertainment for the benefit of their organization—and the reason is because the managers of the theatres complain that it would hurt their business to let negroes into any other part of the building than the gallery. Nor is this the worst manifestation of the prejudice. The Young Men's Christian Association of this city closes its doors to black men, simply and solely because they are black. At Asbury Park, N. J., colored men are not allowed to bathe in the ocean at the same time as whites. The feeling appears to be no less strong in other parts of the country. During a recent Congregational convention in Iowa a lady of Grinnell, a town distinguished for its educational institutions, in describing the work of the "Society of Christian Endeavor," told how the Society had extended its aid to a colored girl who was finely educated, but who, on account of her color, could find no employment except that of a life of drudgery, for which she did not have the required physical strength, and from the effects of which she died.

While such things are true at the North, it is arrant hypocrisy for Northerners to prate about the "insane prejudice" of Southerners against the negro. The truth is, that this color prejudice is entertained by most white people—by a great many who concede that it seems unreasonable, and yet who confess that they cannot get over it. How far this prejudice is the result, conscious or unconscious, of slavery; how far, if at all, it is really a race feeling which is permanent—these are questions which nobody can settle offhand. It is emphatically a matter which calls for patience and forbearance. We must remember that it is only about thirty years since Abraham Lincoln, in his famous joint debate with Douglas, in answering on the 18th of September, 1858, the question whether he was "really in favor of producing a perfect equality between the negroes and white people," replied:

> "I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races. I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of making voters or jurors of negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people; and I will say in addition to this that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will for ever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality."

Abraham Lincoln would not stand by that doctrine if he were living in 1889, when a white man is tried for murder in Charleston, S. C., before a jury half of whose members are negroes; but neither would Abraham Lincoln, in 1889, call it "monstrous" for Southern people still to entertain a prejudice of color which he had himself once so fully shared. He would be likely to suggest to the Boutelles and the Clarksons that they had better devote all their energies for the present to the task laid before them by a candid Iowa editor who says, apropos of the Grinnell incident: "Hadn't we better pick out some of the beams from our own eyes before we make such a fuss about the motes in the eyes of others?"

THEODORE DWIGHT WOOLSEY.

To President Woolsey belongs the rare honor of taking the lead in two great intellectual movements. He laid the foundations of American scholarship; he taught men to apply that scholarship to the social and political problems of the day. In each of these departments of his life work he was preëminent; in the combination of the two he stood alone and unrivalled.

He began his professorship of Greek at Yale College in 1831. In 1834 he published his edition of the "Alcestis" of Euripides. Fifty-five years have elapsed since that time, but Woolsey's "Alcestis" has not been superseded. It is to-day, for its purpose, the best edition in existence. In spite of the advances in philology and in textual criticism, we have nothing which so well meets the need of the student. No higher praise than this can possibly be given to his work. Yet it was done wholly without obtrusion of himself. The notes were not written to show the learning of the author, but to assist the learning of the student. Vast as is the range of knowledge which they display, in philology, in literature, and in politics, the self-restraint and self-effacement of the author are still more striking. His work was everything to him, his own share in its credit least of all things. Similar editions of classical authors followed in rapid succession. The "Antigone" appeared in 1835; the "Prometheus" and the "Electra" in 1837; the "Gorgias" in 1843. Side by side with his friend Prof. Felton, he gave the world tangible evidences of American scholarship which did not need to fear comparison with the best which Europe could produce.

His election to the Presidency of Yale College in 1846 interrupted his distinctively classical work, but only to give him a wider field of influence in the College and in the world. He at once raised the standard of quality in all departments, as he had previously done in his own. Nor was this result confined to Yale alone. At the time of President Woolsey's resignation, a leading Harvard professor truthfully said that all our colleges should share in honoring the man to whose work they were all alike indebted for their standard of scholarship, and for no small part of their progress towards its realization.

No direct comparison can readily be made between the work of President Woolsey's generation and that of President Eliot's. The two are essentially different in kind. The one was primarily an advance in quality; the other, in breadth and extent. The latter has more visible monuments to display, but the former was the necessary prerequisite to it. The man who laid the foundation accomplished what was in many respects the most difficult part of the task. To have done this, and to have done it well, is President Woolsey's highest honor. It is true that he did not foresee what Yale College and other colleges have since become. Our universities have developed on lines different from those which he expected, and in directions which he would in some instances have opposed. But it is none the less true that his work made subsequent development possible. Sound scholarship, vigorous teaching power, and the influence of a strong man on strong men were the vitally necessary basis for all healthful growth. These he furnished. That the subsequent development took a different line from what he expected is no discredit to him. To a man who cared so much for his work and so little for himself, it involves no shadow of failure, but marks rather the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

highest success, to have builded better than he knew.

The completeness with which President Woolsey did his work has made it hard for the younger generation to realize its magnitude, while his complete absence of self-assertion in carrying it out has perhaps prevented his personality from taking so strong a hold on the general public as it might otherwise have done. Ten people have a definite idea of President Hopkins to one who has any such picture of President Woolsey. This is what President Woolsey himself would have wished. But it was not the result of any lack of strength of character on his part; it was rather from that excess of strength which could make him afford to be self-forgetful. Those who were under his influence could not for one moment be blinded to his greatness. His self-restraint was not the result of timidity, but precisely the reverse. He had so strong a sense of the importance of the work to be done that he knew no fear in doing it. In the days of his tutorship the most turbulent of the students who came under his eye were afraid of him. However reckless they might be in their wrong-doing, there was a recklessness in his right-doing which was more than a match for them, and which frightened those who otherwise feared neither God nor man. This quality he retained to the end of his life. He was ready to tell the truth regardless of consequences. Towards the close of his Presidency he was asked, under somewhat delicate circumstances, his judgment of a man with whom he had been brought in contact, and was assured that if he gave a hint of his opinion, it would be used in such a way as not to compromise him. Scorning all such concealment, he openly replied: "You may tell people that I think very little of the man." Some years later, when a prominent politician tried to frighten President Woolsey into a retraction of certain expressions of which he had made use, the only reply was a reassertion of the same views, with such added force that the politician was only too glad to let the controversy terminate without another word.

His modesty alone prevented the world from knowing the vastness of his range of information. At a time when breadth of education was far rarer than it now is, he had read both law and theology, and had pursued a course of classical and philological study in Europe lasting several years. Nor did he allow the duties of his college office to narrow his range of subsequent work. Let one instance suffice. In the year 1864 the *New Englander* published a series of articles on the revival of learning in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Knowledge of the Italian Renaissance was not at that time so easy to acquire as it has been since the appearance of Mr. Symonds's work. Such articles as these could only be the result of hard individual study at first hand. Yet the author was none other than President Woolsey himself, who, in the midst of his classics and his politics, his interest in the duties of his office, and his equally absorbing interest in public affairs, had found time to carry out, almost as a diversion, what would have exhausted another man as a specialty by itself.

The influence of President Woolsey's character on those who came in contact with him can never be adequately described. He served as a model to those who worked with him, as well as to those who worked under him. Though strong in will, he was so scrupulously truthful that those who differed from him always had a fair chance to make their views known. They might complain of opposition, they never could complain of unfairness. His character was an ever-present force. His sermons—which to many Yale graduates formed the most impressive part of his teaching—were not mere essays, however full they might be of accurate knowledge and sound reasoning; they were the outgrowth of his life and his personal experience, and their words had the whole weight of his personal character behind them. He was a religious man in the best sense of the word—one to whom the supreme importance of moral questions was an ever-present fact, and who had fully learned the lesson of self-renunciation and the strength which comes from it.

President Woolsey's political work began when his educational work culminated. As President of Yale College, he felt the necessity for more vigorous teaching of history and politics. Not that he had ever in his earlier years lost sight of this fact—his notes to the Greek classics are full of allusions to profound questions of law and public morals. But his position as President gave him a wider opportunity for these teachings, of which he was not slow to avail himself. The first and most important published result of these labors was his 'International Law,' which appeared in 1860. It is a most characteristic book, in which it is as hard for the casual reader to see the amount of effective work which it represents, as for the casual observer to do justice to President Woolsey's influence on the cause of American education. But the more thoroughly the careful student knows the difficulties of the subject, the more he will appreciate the book. The men who rate it highest are those, like Sir Henry Maine, who themselves stand highest and see clearest.

In 1869 President Woolsey published his 'Essays on Divorce,' a leading event in an agitation which has already borne practical fruit. His 'Political Science' appeared in 1887. It was a much larger work than any of its predecessors, but a less successful one. The author originally intended to write on a more limited topic—the theory of the State and the doctrine of rights. It would have been better if he had done so; but he allowed himself to be over-persuaded by friends, and gave the book its present scope in deference to their advice. It is a work of wonderful learning, but out of harmony with the political and ethical thinking of the time. It has been a monument of the author's knowledge rather than a living influence upon others.

It is rare that a man stands so high that an obituary notice can tell the whole truth, and record his limitations as well as his achievements, his less successful deeds as well as his more successful. But President Woolsey was such a man. He told the truth without respect of persons; he wished others to do the same about himself. A smaller man might need to be set on a pedestal. President Woolsey requires no such artificial enhancement of his greatness. He could afford to scorn exaggeration or concealment, and stand before the world for what he was. Thus he did in his life, and thus we have tried to do in this imperfect sketch of his career.

OFFICE-HOLDING IN THE COLONIES.

WASHINGTON, July 1, 1889.

THE recent publication of the letter-books of Horatio Sharpe, Proprietary Governor of Maryland during the French and Indian war, throws much light upon the internal management of the province at that time; and among the many interesting points covered is that of Government patronage and the distribution of offices in those days. To say that the conditions are the same to-day would be claiming too much; and yet the principles that controlled the bestowal of positions in 1755 were essentially the same that control the distribution of spoils in 1889. I have before me some unpublished letters of Richard Henry Lee, a man to whom history has not yet awarded his full due, and the two volumes of Governor Dinwiddie's correspondence, from which illustrations will be drawn. In Virginia, a royal colony, and in Maryland, a proprietary government, the use and abuse of office-holding were similar, and by no means inapplicable to the conditions of to-day. If a well-ordered system could be looked for anywhere in the British colonies of America, it ought to be found in these tobacco-growing colonies, the "brightest jewels" of the English crown, because the highest examples of the wisdom, justice, and power of the selfish and costly mercantile system.

In the royal colony, Virginia, all honor flowed from the King. The Governor was appointed by his Majesty, but usually resided in London, Lord Botetourt being the first to reside in Virginia since Lord Culpeper's time; an interval of nearly a century intervening between the two administrations. The burden of government thus fell on the lieutenant-governor and a council, whose members were appointed by royal mandamus, and usually on the recommendation of the lieutenant-governor. The judges in the higher courts were members of the council, and those of the county courts held their office of the executive, while nearly all minor offices were at its disposal also. The House of Burgesses, composed of two members from each county, represented the popular branch, and with the Governor and Council formed the General Assembly. It is curious to find R. H. Lee lamenting in 1766 the absence in the Virginian Constitution or form of government of some balance like the House of Lords in England. "All the executive, two-thirds of the legislative, and the whole judiciary powers are in the same body of magistracy"; and he quotes Montesquieu to show that such a condition means the worst of slavery.

More than this, the Assembly was a popular branch only in name, as it was subject to the will of the Governor. There was no law directing the calling of new assemblies; there was none appointing any time for the meeting of the representative body when chosen. The

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Assembly did pass an act, modelled after the English statute adopted after the Revolution, directing that a new assembly should be called once in seven years at least, and should hold a session at least once in three years; but the royal approbation was not granted, and so the question of holding sessions remained a prerogative possession. The laws of this body were not final, but were subject to the King's veto, which will account for the poverty of the statute-books in what may be called real legislation. Petty matters of detail, entails, rents, formation of counties, erection of townships, and establishment of ferries, were the leading subjects, and it is only when a proposition to form a "bank," that is, to issue a paper currency, arises that any indication of the struggle between royalty and the people which gradually developed into the Revolution, is encountered.

The position of a royal governor was no sinecure; that of a proprietary governor was even more laborious, as it represented rather a business than a political interest. He was the land agent of the proprietor, controlling the disposition of lands within the colony, and collecting the quit-rents; he was the civil and military head of the province, and responsible for the defence and safety of the colonists. But between the conflicting interests of Proprietary and colonists, the means obtained from the people by various charges or rents, and jealously guarded by the Legislature, were not commensurate to the ends, and the refusal of a grant of money by a "levelling House of Burgesses, too much of a republican way of thinking," reduced the Governor to a state of powerlessness in which he easily became a vulgar scold. In Pennsylvania, in Maryland, and in Virginia the relations of the Governor to the Legislature were so strained that it was difficult for them to obtain money even for the most pressing emergencies.

That the Proprietary or the Governor was, too often, to use a vulgar phrase, "on the make," using his powers and his patronage to further his own ends, is merely the bald truth. In Pennsylvania, no important act of the Assembly could receive the sanction of the Proprietary Governor without a "present," which amounted to as much as £500 a law, and was divided between the Governor and the Proprietary. "It is a happy country," wrote Franklin in regard to this abuse, "where justice, and what was your own before, can be had for ready money. It is another addition to the value of money, and, of course, another spur to industry. Every land is not so blessed."

If legislation was brought to such a market, it is reasonable to expect that places of honor and profit should be subject to the same system of disposition. Col. Plater, when offered the office of Secretary of Maryland, looked into the profits of the place, and concluded to refuse should he have to "pay more than one-fourth part of the income," and a like proportion of what money or presents he might receive on the nomination of county clerks; though Sharpe thought he "ought to have offered one-third of the profits at least." Richard Henry Lee, in 1772, requested his brothers, William and Arthur, to use their influence with the Ministry to "fix the profit of some place" with him.

"Have an eye to the deputy secretary's place. I suppose more than £1,000 per annum cannot be paid the principal [*i. e.*, the secretary, an absentee], and I really believe 'tis worth £3,000 per annum this currency. Suppose, then, £1,000 sterling was paid the principal, this, at 25 difference of exchange, would leave £1,750 currency for the deputy. One-half of this I would undertake most readily to do the business for, and remit the rest. In this view, it might be well to give a pretty good sum for the deputyship besides the annual composition."

Was ever bribe more openly offered for an appointment?

The Governor's Council should have been composed of good executive ability, and in Virginia a high order of talent was obtained, the King's representative being anxious to gain the influence of men of property and spirit. In Maryland the Governor was pestered with recommendations, although he wrote more than once that "to be free from fault, or to be a worthy man and good companion, is not, in my opinion, sufficient at this time [1755, the year of Braddock's expedition] to recommend a person to a seat at the Council-Board."

"I think I have already hinted to you that I am not permitted to dispose of any of the most honorable and lucrative offices, because another person loves to have all the applications made to himself. This perhaps is of itself sufficient to lessen the weight and influence that a governor would otherwise have; but as it has been thought proper of late to saddle these offices with about £550 per ann., and I am charged with the care of making the most advantageous bargains, I submit to your own judgment whether it is possible for a person in my situation to continue always popular. Anybody that can get introduced to Mr. Calvert, is sure to bring me an open letter desiring I will appoint him to this or that, or the first vacant office. Should I have any objection to the person so introduced and recommended to me, or for any other reason neglect to comply with the terms of such letter, that man thinks himself hardly dealt by, and immediately commences my enemy."

"I begin to see," he wrote to Calvert on another occasion, "that the art of disposing of places so as to avoid offence is one of the most difficult parts of government"; and, after an experience of three years, to Lord Baltimore, "Any privilege or power of nominating to vacant offices is one that, in my opinion, no governor has reason to be very fond of. For my own part, I can assure your Lordship that it has made me many enemies, and that, on account of the recommendations that I have been obliged to accept, it has been very rarely in my power to make a friend by that means." Still, office was sometimes used for political effect, and the position of councillor was offered to a member of the lower house to abate his "virulency," and the profits of the surveyorship were considered a fitting instrument to make a "useful tool" of a member of the House who, by his "cunning and capacity," might lead or "impose on" some of the Burgesses. Church-livings were dispensed in the same way, and the revenue of the colony mortgaged through pensions given to gentlemen for whom the Proprietary had a great regard, although the recipient of a favor was not required to remove to and reside in the colony.

The governors were, however, only too anxious to extend their own influence; and honor, place, and profit were the easiest and least expensive means offered. Dunmore, in making nominations to a vacancy in the Council in 1772, reminded the Earl of Dartmouth, in terms of deference, that Lord Hillsborough had promised that "no one not nominated by him [Dunmore] should be appointed." So Sharpe, in spite of his complaints, would much have liked to distribute the plums of patronage:

"I have before hinted to you what channel all preferment has gone through since I have been honored with his Lordship's commission, and if a reformation be not shortly made, the authority of a governor in this province will be a very shadow. . . . I hope you will be able to convince him that a governor without power to oblige or reward, as well as to punish, can never make many friends, and that it is more than likely that a majority of those who obtain favors without my approbation or interest, set light by my power or commence my enemies."

But the Proprietaries were bent upon retaining the function for themselves; and when the Pennsylvania Assembly recommended to the Governor a person for the trivial office of receiving a lighthouse duty, it was characterized as "an encroachment on the prerogative of the Crown."

All the offices being at the disposal of the Governor (as representing the King or the Proprietary), and the activity of the Legislature being curbed by the Executive, the sphere of action to one who did not happen to be in the good graces of the Governor was necessarily limited, and not likely to call out the best talents attainable. Sharpe complained that, owing to the short term of membership in the lower house, "few gentlemen will submit so frequently to the inconveniences that such a canvass for seats in that house must necessarily subject themselves to; by which means there are too many instances of the lowest persons, at least of men of small fortunes, no soul, and very mean capacities, appearing as representatives of their respective counties." Lee, as early as 1769, only a few years after his bold attack on the scheme of the defaulting treasurer of the colony, and the prominence he had gained in connection with the protests against the Stamp Act, found the "attendance on assemblies so expensive, and the power of doing good so rarely occurring, that I am determined to quit that employment." And a year later he wrote: "I have many reasons that are absolutely decisive against continuing a popular candidate any longer. . . . If, therefore, I am to continue in the public service, it must be in the Council, . . . the power of checking ill, and the means of doing good, occurring oftener in our upper than in our lower house."

The manner of conducting the elections and the expense involved were some of the reasons that made popular representation an undesirable effort. Those who were "in" did not hesitate to truckle to the people's views. Sharpe declared that, as an election approached, the Legislature would become perverse and obstinate, standing out for its rights, and catering, as it were, to the popular vote; full of its own opinions, and entirely deaf to argument and reason; seeking to cast odium on the Governor by passing bills speciously framed so as to comply with his recommendations, but only on the sacrifice of his duty to his master, or so as to satisfy a popular demand that could be gratified only by the Governor's disobeying his instructions.

Those who were "out" were forced to seek the favor of the powerful. Washington, when only twenty-three, expressed a wish to "take a poll" and represent his county in the House if his "chance was tolerably good"; and he asked his brother to sound his friends on the subject, and, should they seem inclined to promote his interest, to beg their assistance. "Conduct the whole till you are satisfied of the sentiments of those I have mentioned, with an air of indifference and unconcern; after that you may regulate your conduct according to circumstances." Before he was twenty-six, this ambitious youth had run as a candidate to the Burgesses, and met with a bad defeat, receiving only 40 votes out of a total of 581. In 1758 he was successful, and his accounts give some light on the election methods of that day, for his friends expended nearly £39 in entertaining the freeholders (all but £3 went for liquor), and Washington wrote to his manager that his only fear was that the money had been spent in that way "with too sparing a hand." Being

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

absent at the time with Col. Bouquet in his march against Duquesne, Col. Wood, a local celebrity, acted as his representative, being "carried round the town in the midst of a general applause and huzzaing for Col. Washington." A "dull barbacue, and yet duller dances" were features of the election, and then the excitement subsided. All appeared to depend on the personal favor and address of the candidate, for, save in Pennsylvania, no definite issues were mentioned or discussed. Franklin recorded in 1764, doubtless with no little pride: "In none of the fourteen elections [he had won to the Assembly] did I ever appear as a candidate. I never did, directly or indirectly, solicit any man's vote." And he speaks of "double tickets" and "whole boxes of forged votes" as weapons used to defeat him by the Opposition—practices of which the present generation know somewhat.

The position of the Governor saved the colonies from one great abuse, an interference with the county elections. There might be "Government candidates," but the frequent elections (annual) made much of such local interference with a free choice too costly and nugatory, for the people would remain opposed to the Executive, and it was in the people that the choice of delegates ultimately resided. An unpopular representative was too easily shelved to make it an object to back him; and whatever favor and influence the Governor sought was in preference obtained by the distribution of the offices at his disposal, and not by an attempt to determine the complexion of the House. Every effort was made to extend this influence; but when the Revolution came, it was seen how hollow and unreliable it was. We have had in our day attempts to build up a party by the abuse of patronage that have been no more successful than were the attempts of these colonial governors. In short, we may find in the problems presented by the civil service to-day much the same conditions and difficulties that were met with 130 years ago.

WORTHINGTON C. FORD.

RUSSIA BEFORE EUROPE.

PARIS, June 27, 1889.

THE success of the French Exhibition has amounted to a sort of intoxication, and created a sort of optimism which has rendered us almost indifferent to the incidents of the politics of Europe. Some of these incidents, however, have been such as to attract attention, and even to create a sort of uneasiness, and almost of anxiety. The Emperor of Russia lately spoke of the Prince of Montenegro as "his only faithful ally." These words had the effect of a thunderbolt in a blue sky. To speak of a chieftain who can, in his mountains, arm from ten to twenty thousand men only, as his sole ally, is to say that Russia needs no allies, that she is strong enough to resist all the forces of the triple alliance of Prussia, Austria, and Italy. Russia repeats now what Charles Albert once said: "L'Italia farà da se."

There is no use denying the fact—the tension between Germany and Russia is increasing every day. Immediately after his father's death, the young Emperor Wilhelm II. made a visit to Cronstadt and to Peterhof. This visit has yet to be returned by the Emperor of Russia; it is stated that he absolutely refuses to return it with any pomp at Berlin: all that he is willing to do is to see the Emperor of Germany somewhere on his way to make his usual visit to the Danish royal family. There is little doubt that the advances made by Wilhelm to Alexander have had no result whatever; the Emperor of Russia is immovable in his determination to enter into no combinations, no alliances, no political arrangements with Prince Bismarck. He considers that his father made too many sacrifices to the ambition of Prussia, and was never rewarded for it; that the Treaty of Berlin robbed Russia of all she could expect in the East, after she had conducted her armies to the very gates of Constantinople. He is biding his time. Pacific, and determined not to engage in any war, he believes that time works for him, and that he has no need of entering into direct hostilities with Austria and with Prussia; that Panslavism is gradually doing the work of Russia, not only in the Balkan peninsula and in the newborn principalities of Rumania, Bulgaria, and Servia, but even in the Slavic provinces of the Austrian Empire. His policy has become a sort of masterly inactivity; and this inactivity helps him better than any direct interference. It is a curious fact that whenever there have been Russian delegates and generals in Bulgaria and Servia, there has been an outcry against Russia; as soon as the Russians leave these provinces the Russian influence again becomes uppermost. It is at the present hour predominant in Servia, though the Regents are apparently completely independent.

Panslavism is a mysterious force: it addresses itself sometimes to reactionary, sometimes to revolutionary passions; its chief support is the Greek religion; the metropolitans are everywhere the most powerful instruments of Russian ambition. Last September an incident occurred in Slavonia which made a great noise. The Emperor Francis Joseph reproved in strong terms, at the Castle of Bellovar, Bishop Strossmayer of Diakovar, who had addressed a telegram to Kiev, on the day of the anniversary of Saint Vladimir, who introduced Christianity into Russia. Bishop Strossmayer spoke in his telegram of the destinies of Russia and of her great mission in the world. The opposition to Prince Ferdinand in Bulgaria is headed by the Metropolitan. The Metropolitan of Servia was the chief adversary of King Milan, who represented the Austrian influence. The struggle between Austria and Russia in the Balkans is in reality a struggle between Catholicism and the great Orthodox Church; this rivalry underlies all the small incidents of daily politics.

The Emperor of Austria has found it necessary to make an indirect answer to the speech in which the Emperor of Russia asserted his friendship for the Prince of Montenegro. He has given a warning to all the Powers, in saying that "the situation of Europe continues to be little reassuring." While hoping that peace can still be long preserved, notwithstanding the great armaments which are continually increasing, he regrets that the resolution of King Milan of Servia has placed the power in the hands of a Regency during the minority of the young King. He expresses a hope that the prudence and the patriotism of the Servians will preserve their country from grave dangers, and he has some words of encouragement for Bulgaria, where order continues to reign and where great progress is making, notwithstanding the difficult situation of the principality.

Nothing could be clearer than this language, guarded as it is. It is evident that all the dangers to which the Emperor of Austria alludes, the difficulties he speaks of, have their origin in the policy of Russia and in the agitations of the Panslavist party. For a long time it seemed as if the word of Chancellor Gortchakoff after the Crimean war might be repeated: "La Russie ne boude pas, elle se recueille." The great Northern Empire had a merely negative and defensive policy. For a long time after the Treaty of Berlin, the old policy of the alliance of the three Emperors did not seem quite abandoned, but Russia by degrees assumed a more independent policy, and her independence now borders upon hostility. In vain has Prince Bismarck tried every means of conciliating the Emperor of Russia; all seems to be lost on his solitary will, his impenetrability and sullenness. The Emperor is influenced by the passions of his people, which feels an innate hostility to German culture and to Germans. In a country which has no parliamentary institutions, no free press, no chambers, the sovereign, while he seems autocratic, is nevertheless swayed by a sort of public opinion which finds its expression in a hundred ways. The order of the day in Russia is now a return to old Russian habits, costumes, institutions, prejudices, a total severance from all occidental influences. The Emperor leads the people, and the people leads the Emperor in this new crusade. A war between Russia and Germany would really be a war between two different civilizations.

Everybody has felt that France and Russia were drawn towards each other during the past few years by an almost irresistible instinct. There has never been a complete political understanding between them, no treaty of alliance has been signed; but the two nations have felt more interest in each other, they have made a sort of moral alliance. The Russian Government has several times intimated that Russia desired to see France make herself stronger. The instability of our cabinets, the character of our republican institutions, the conservative sentiments of the Emperor have prevented any definitive alliance. But the Emperor's advisers have persuaded him lately that too much importance ought not to be attached to the incidents of our parliamentary life; that beneath our political divisions there is a strong undercurrent of patriotism; that in case of war all party division would rapidly disappear, and that the chiefs of the army would play the principal rôle in the development of events. On the subject of the French army, the Emperor receives very special and complete information, and the conclusion which has been arrived at by his informants is, that the French army to-day is in excellent order, has very able commanders, and constitutes a political element of the greatest importance.

It was thought, at one moment, that the painful incident of Sangallo would make bad blood between Russia and France; Russian blood had been shed, and there certainly was much irritation manifested in the Russian press. On the first occasion when, after the affair of Sangallo, the Emperor met the diplomatic body, the French Ambassador, M. de Laboulaye, naturally felt some anxiety and his colleagues much curiosity. The Emperor approached M. de Laboulaye with his usual courtesy, and merely said, "I regret deeply the incident which has just taken place," and then, after a short pause, "But it will not embroil us" (*cela ne nous brouillera pas*).

Between the constellation formed by the three Powers of Central Europe, Prussia, Austria, and Italy, and the nebulous moral alliance of France and Russia, what will be the conduct of England? Her interests are at present in the hands of a very able man, Lord Salisbury, who has lost much of his old ardor, but has gained in diplomatic knowledge, in foresight, in true statesmanship. He fully understands the forces which are opposing each other, he feels keenly the great responsibilities of his post; he has, so far, not committed a single fault. England has her hands free; she is so

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

placed that she can observe the development of events, bide her time, and choose her hour. We regret that in the small matter of the conversion of the privileged debt of Egypt, the French Foreign Office should have shown some ill-will to England, at a time when it is essential that France should make no enemies. All the Powers had assented to this conversion, which would benefit the Egyptian fellah. France has asked some guarantees, and demanded the fixing of a date for the evacuation of Egypt. Our Foreign Office cannot be consoled for the diminution of our influence in the valley of the Nile. Time will show what effects this attitude of the French Government may have on the orientation of the English policy.

THE ITALY OF HAWTHORNE.—I.

ROME, May, 1889.

THERE are few books put so often into the hands of English and American visitors to Rome as Hawthorne's 'Marble Faun,' or, as it is more generally known here, 'Transformation,' from the cheap and widely circulated Tauchnitz edition, which has followed the English title. Pilgrimages are made to what is now generally known as Hilda's Tower; and when young ladies go to the Capuchin church to see the picture of Guido, they almost dread to find a dead monk laid out and bleeding from the nostrils. The book gives a strong impression of local color.

Like every one else in America, I read the book soon after its first appearance, and was naturally struck by the mysteriousness and fancifulness of the story, which, in my ignorance of Italy, seemed perfectly possible. I was deluded by this feigned impression of local color; and as Ruskin and the other art teachers of the moment were then decrying Raphael and all the more modern Italian painters, we were inclined to agree with Hawthorne that nothing better could be done with many frescoes and paintings than to whitewash or burn them, without reflecting that the works of art thus devoted to destruction were those so highly praised by the pre-Raphaelite school. Twenty years later the book came into my hand one day at a hotel in Perugia. I had some dim remembrance of the scenes laid there; but when I found that there had been given to the cathedral a wonderfully beautiful façade which does not exist and never has been built, the book was impatiently thrown aside. It is plain enough that the front of the great church at Siena is meant, as it is described in the romance in almost the same words as in Hawthorne's 'Italian Notebooks,' and the error may be due to a freak of memory.

Again, out of idle curiosity, I have read the book. But this time it amused me to make contemporaneously a study of all that is published under Hawthorne's name, including his 'Notebooks' as well as his various biographies. It is a sad confession to say that, after all, the book of his which I look back to with most affection, and which I have just learned that he chiefly wrote—'Peter Parley's Universal History'—was not published with his name.

It is interesting to study the manner in which Hawthorne's novels were made up; and for this the materials are ample. Few authors have been so thoroughly exploited by their family as Hawthorne: it would seem as if there were scarcely a scrap of his writing still remaining unpublished, except that, with a certain amount of deference to his feelings, some passages of his 'Notebooks' have been omitted which would be of the greatest interest to us, as they have admittedly been rewritten or used with slight changes as component parts of his finished works. It is impossible to agree with his latest biographer that it is idle and useless to study Hawthorne's life and books in connection. Whatever may be the case with his family, it is certainly not true for us, that "if he had never written a line, he would still have possessed, as a human being, scarcely less interest and importance than he does now." Nor has for us "his literary phase seemed a phase only, and not the largest or most characteristic." Indeed, for the world at large, this phase is the only important part of his life, and in general we care to know only so much of his biography as throws light on his books.

We wait with sympathetic impatience for the book of Mr. James Russell Lowell, who knew Hawthorne more or less intimately—so far as one could really know him. Of what has been published, the biography by his son Julian Hawthorne is too long and trivial, although it contains many interesting details. The best thing, on the whole, is the appreciative little book of Mr. Henry James, which does, in some sense, justice—although many Americans say injustice—to Hawthorne's surroundings during the first fifty years of his life.

For a study of the composition of the first two American romances the materials are scanty or have been withheld. The ideas of both plots come from old New England traditions, and the stories themselves are similar to those in 'Twice-Told Tales' and 'Mosses from an Old Manse,' although developed to far greater length and with more minuteness of detail. We know also that Hawthorne, when he wrote the 'Scarlet Letter,' was in a very gloomy state of mind, owing to his having recently been turned out of his position as Surveyor of the Salem Custom-house. This may account in part for the sad tone of the book. The 'House of the Seven Gables' was written in happier moments and amid brighter scenes—the charming landscape of the Berkshire Hills. But even Lenox was not always pleasing to him, for he says in a letter:

"This is a horrible, horrible, hor-ri-ble climate: one knows not, for ten minutes together, whether he is too cool or too warm; but he is always one or the other, and the constant result is a miserable disturbance of the system. I detest it! I detest it! I detest it! I hate Berkshire with my whole soul, and would joyfully see its mountains laid flat."

The 'Blithedale Romance' was written, after another change of residence, in West Newton, a rural suburb of Boston, where—as his son says—"the omnipresent ugliness compels a man to write in self-defence." The background of the book is, of course, Brook Farm, where Hawthorne spent a year as a participator in that absurd and fantastic socialistic experiment. Much of the charm of the book is due to personal reminiscence, and in Miles Coverdale Hawthorne treated himself in a humorous, semi-autobiographic way—much as he has done in his private letters and in the introduction to the 'Scarlet Letter.' In Zenobia we seem to have a glimpse of Margaret Fuller, as she appeared to the imagination of those who did not know her, in spite of the great want of likeness. But, as Mr. Henry James very well says:

"There is no strictness in the representation by novelists of persons who have struck them in life, and there can in the nature of things be none. From the moment the imagination takes a hand in the game, the inevitable tendency is to divergence, to following what may be called new scents. The original gives hints, but the writer does what he likes with them, and imports new elements into the picture."

It is on the whole to be regretted that President Pierce ever gave to his friend that Nessus shirt of the consulate at Liverpool. That productive artistic power which had culminated in the 'Blithedale Romance,' ceased for a long time; and neither 'Our Old Home' nor 'The Marble Faun' reached the level of the American novels. Hawthorne was greatest when on his native soil and writing about characters whose nature he could understand and appreciate. English life, notwithstanding its many resemblances and points of connection, was to him always a foreign one. In spite of his long residence at Liverpool and of his frequent trips to all parts of England, and the possibility of many and interesting acquaintances, he could never assimilate himself to English life, nor even thoroughly accustom himself to English surroundings. In Liverpool he lived in a second-rate or even fifth-rate boarding-house, confining himself chiefly to the society of American ship-captains. Although often in London for months at a time, he saw very little of London society, even of its literary coteries. He himself felt his isolation, for he several times mentions it—rather, however, as if it were a praiseworthy thing, and one to be proud of. In a London suburb, he says, "the preceding occupant of the house (evidently a most unamiable person in his lifetime) scowled inhospitably from above the mantelpiece, as if indignant that an American should try to make himself at home there." And again, in his journal, "I seem to myself like a spy or a traitor when I meet their eyes, and am conscious that I neither hope nor fear in sympathy with them, although they look at me in full confidence of sympathy. Their heart 'knoweth its own bitterness,' and as for me, being a stranger and an alien, I 'intermeddle not with their joy.'" And yet Hawthorne had two very good English friends, Henry A. Bright and Francis Bennoch—the former of whom, however, he had first met in America.

It is absurd to say, with Hawthorne's son, that few Americans ever journeyed thither "better equipped than they [his parents] for appreciating and enjoying what lay before them." Doubtless they had read many books, though the absence of allusions to reading or to interest in any book of the day in Hawthorne's extremely objective notebooks and journals is as curious as the lack of mention of any love of literature in his biography. Poetry and literary and historical associations had prepared their imagination for appreciating what they were about to see; but very often external circumstances interfered. This is especially noticeable in Italy.

The journey, chiefly by sea, from Marseilles to Rome was wretched. Genoa seemed cheerless; Leghorn and Civita Vecchia were worse. During the early part of the stay at Rome the weather was cold, though sunny; then rain came on, and Hawthorne caught cold, and finally had to sit shivering over a fire in hope of warmer weather. Even after this he was not comfortable nor happy. As he knew almost no Italian, he could not enter into the life of the people, and his daily walks through the streets of Rome and in the Campagna could only show him the outside of things. As his son says, he cared less and sympathized less with Italy than he had done with England:

"Upon Italy, however, his eyes rested with no deeper sentiment than belongs to a respectful and intelligent curiosity. He had no personal stake in the matter; whatever faults or perfections Italy might possess were merely phenomenal to him, not vital. The Italian genius had no affiliations with his own; it was objective to his mind—something to examine and speculate about, not intuitively to apprehend. The Italian people might be what they

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chose, and do what they liked; his equanimity would remain undisturbed."

The journey from Rome to Florence was an agreeable change, and he wrote in his diary:

"I absolutely walk on the smooth stones of Florence for the mere pleasure of walking; and, warm as the weather is getting to be, I never feel that inclination to sink down in a heap and never stir again, which was my dull torment and misery as long as I stayed at Rome. I hardly think there can be a place in the world where life is more delicious for its own simple sake than here."

Part of that summer and autumn he spent at the Villa Montauto, on the hill of Bellosguardo, which has one of the most beautiful views of the neighborhood, looking on one side over and beyond Florence towards Vallombrosa, and on the other over the valley of the Arno far off towards Pistoia. It was so near as to enable him to walk into Florence almost daily. Scarcely had he returned to Rome when one of his daughters was taken down with Roman fever, and for four months he was too anxious and despairing to enjoy the life of Rome. Perhaps from his ignorance of the language, Hawthorne apparently made no Italian acquaintances, and, with few exceptions, seems to have known no one outside the American and English colonies. He saw something of Mr. W. W. Story and something of the Brownings; had occasional glimpses of Mrs. Jameson, Miss Bremer, T. A. Trollope, Gibson, and Read, as well as of passers-by such as Mr. Bryant, of whom he always speaks very harshly; Mr. Hamilton Fish, Mr. John P. Kennedy, and his old friend ex-President Pierce. But his chief intimate friends were apparently a few American painters and sculptors, such as Brown and Thompson at Rome and Powers at Florence. Yet, although these sufficed to interest him and helped him to pass the time, he saw their shortcomings and felt their inferiority. Of one of them he wrote, and the description is applicable to more than one:

"Mr. —— has now been ten years in Italy, and after all this time he is entirely American in everything but the most external surface of his manners; scarcely Europeanized or much modified even in that. He is a native of ——, but had his early breeding in New York, and might, for any polish that I can discern in him, still be a country shopkeeper in the interior of New York State or New England. How strange! For one expects to find the polish, the close grain and white purity of marble in the artist who works in that noble material; but after all he handles *clay*, and, judging by the specimens I have seen here, is apt to *be* clay—not of the finest—himself."

He saw through all their little quarrels and jealousies, and remarks once: "I repeat these things only as another instance how invariably every sculptor uses his chisel and mallet to smash and deface the marble work of every other."

Mrs. Hawthorne had some notions of art. She had dallied with brush and pencil, and had once "copied so perfectly a highly finished landscape of Allston that (as Ellery Channing said), being framed alike, when the two pictures were seen together even Franklin Dexter did not know which was which." Having, therefore, some notions of art, her great delight in Italy was to visit the galleries and study the pictures, trying, like so many others who can be seen there nowadays, to discover their inward meaning, but not perhaps always succeeding. Hawthorne, on the contrary, had not the least feeling for art. There are persons who by experience and hard work can become good judges of pictures and learn to tell copies from originals; can even get to appreciate the possibilities of an artist from his early attempts, and whose opinion, therefore, as connoisseurs, is worth having. These in the end must get to be fond of pictures, if only in a technical way, although in point of fact they are only a finer kind of tea-tasters and wine-tasters. Hawthorne had not even this quality, but, because he thought it was his duty, he dragged himself wearily through miles of picture galleries, though admitting to himself that it was a great trial, as he could never take in more than a few objects at a time. Sculpture he thought he could appreciate, but he disliked the nude. "I do not altogether see the necessity of ever sculpturing another nakedness. Man is no longer a naked animal; his clothes are as natural to him as his skin, and sculptors have no more right to undress him than to flay him." But as to pictures he was in a hopeless state of confusion. He wanted the colors all strong, bright, and fresh, and even then they often lacked the charm of being in brilliant frames; just as he thought that the mosaic of the "Transfiguration" must give a better representation of Raphael's idea than the original picture in its present state, and just as he preferred the churches which had the most gaudy interiors of colored and polished marbles. While admitting his ignorance, he was somewhat astonished at Mrs. Jameson, who took him on a drive one day.

"She says that she can read a picture like a page of a book; in fact, without perhaps assuming more taste and judgment than really belong to her, it was impossible not to perceive that she gave her companion no credit for knowing one single simplest thing about art. Nor, on the whole, do I think she underrated me; the only mystery is how she came to be so well aware of my ignorance on artistical points." E. S.

Correspondence.

STILL ANOTHER.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: A large audience was assembled in the Sanders Theatre at Cambridge on the 27th of June, to listen to an address by the Hon. Edward J. Phelps, our late Minister to England, before the Harvard Chapter of the Phi Beta Kappa Society. Sharing in the privilege, I was impressed with the fact that the whole discourse formed one long premise to the conclusion of which your readers are so tired.

Mr. Phelps says that foreign affairs should be kept out of party politics, for which domestic affairs furnish a more than sufficient field; that foreign policy should be firm and consistent, which it cannot be while it is the sport of changing parties, instancing the important case of the Fisheries Treaty rejected in the Senate by a strict party vote. He says, again, that other first-class Powers have ambassadors, while we have only ministers plenipotentiary and envoys extraordinary, who are regarded in the diplomatic hierarchy as only of the second rank, so that our men have to take lower places, and only second-class men are, as a rule, sent to us in exchange. He says that it is unworthy of a nation as great and rich as ours that diplomatic posts can be held only by men rich enough and willing to draw largely on their private resources; and, moreover, that while other first-class Powers furnish official residences for their Ministers, our Government leaves even Ministers to Great Britain to find lodgings as best they can. Obvious personal reasons prevented him from referring to the greatest disgrace of all, namely, that foreign embassies should be distributed as rewards for the services of party politicians—a practice to which, in his case as well as in others, Mr. Cleveland made a happy exception.

The explanation of all this is perfectly simple. Foreign affairs are especially the business of executive administration, but Congress has taken possession of administration, and reduced the Executive to impotence except in obedience to its commands. Congress is composed of local men, each of whom cares only for his own constituents and his own seat, and little or nothing for the national interest; or, if he does care, can do nothing about it, and, if he should attempt to, would only injure his party standing. No man can lift his voice in Congress who in any way officially represents the nation. How can a purely national interest be expected to receive any attention? Congress cares nothing what becomes of foreign ministers or of the national dignity abroad. It only knows that, such as they are, these places are good enough to stimulate the best party work at home. While ready to take fat salaries for its members, and to distribute with both hands pensions which are supposed to secure local popularity, it is so jealous of the Executive as to starve and pinch it in every possible way, knowing full well that it has no voice even for remonstrance. Much as it is needed in every department, in none more than foreign affairs is it imperative that the high executive officials should be heard in Congress before the country. Mr. Phelps praises the English because in foreign affairs they give up party discord and support the Government of the time. That is merely because they have somebody outside of party who stands for foreign affairs. Here nobody but party represents anything.

In this connection I may refer to the letter of your correspondent Ernest Bruncken. He admits that the Legislature has taken possession of and abuses the whole power of government, and suggests as a remedy that we should have a separate body, elected solely for administrative purposes. But this idea embodies two principles which are perfectly fatal to good administration—a numerous body with separately elected members. Instead of one set of committees, with anarchy, confusion, and intrigue, we should have two. All the secrecy, lobby work, and infirmity of purpose, with the absence of all responsibility, would be just doubled. If it is wanted to see how such a body, intrusted with executive power, would work, there is a plenty of examples in the school committees of cities and towns. And, after all, the legislative body would get the upper hand, because that branch is always the strongest which holds the purse. What is the need of any such expedient? We have already an ideal administrative organization—a President elected by the whole people, a Cabinet of individual heads of departments appointed by him, and down through the one hundred and twenty thousand or so of offices, single men in every post, and all radiating from the President. Nothing could be more perfect, and to this is owing the incomparable superiority of the Federal Administration over that of any State or city. The reason that it fails at all is because it is paralyzed by the usurpation of Congress. The Executive has no initiative, no guidance of policy, no power of appeal to his constituents, no weapon of defence. He has to feed out the offices to suit his masters of the party machine—except so far as the power of appointment is taken out of his hands by an irresponsible commission—and has to sit idly by while Congress carries on its schemes of local and private interest, with the poor privilege of veto if they get quite too outrageous.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The way to meet the overgrown power of Congress is to set the Executive on his feet, and let him stand or fall by his own strength.

G. B.

Boston, July 4, 1889.

THE SPOILS SYSTEM IN 1829.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: An interesting illustration of your recent editorial on "Rotation and the Presidency" has just come to my notice. A biography of Joseph Duncan, fifth Governor of Illinois, has lately been written by his daughter, a resident of this city, and published in the Fergus Historical Series, Chicago. The book is enriched by many extracts from Governor Duncan's diary, from which I quote the following:

"March 6, 1829. Governor Kinney and E. J. W. wish me to request the removal of certain officers from office, which I declined, as I am opposed to removing competent and worthy men on account of a mere difference of opinion. They appeared to be dissatisfied, but that will make no difference in my conduct, as such a course would be adverse to all my notions of propriety."

"March 7, 1829. Kane, McLean, and myself went into McLean's room to consult about appointments, in the event of removals or vacancies. McLean and myself opposed removals, except for some good cause, other than political."

It is well known that these views of Governor Duncan's led to his final break with Jackson and his support of Clay for the Presidency in 1832. Illinois politics would be in a more hopeful condition to-day if politicians had more of Governor Duncan's independence and sturdy integrity, and more appreciation of the true character of public office as a public trust.

Edward B. Clapp.

Illinois College, Jacksonville.

WITCH-BURNING.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: I notice, in your charming review of *Valera's 'Cartas Americanas,'* the following sentence: "While we [*i. e.*, the New England colonists] were still in our witch-burning stage, Chili was laying the foundations," etc. This accusation of witch-*burning* is very often brought against the Puritans, and is generally received as true, but I have a strong impression that no "witch" was ever burned in New England, although at the period referred to they were so put to death in the mother country. I believe that they were *hanged* in New England, which was assuredly bad enough, but a long way removed from burning.

Can you or any of your readers to whose attention this may come, give authoritative information on this point? My own impression does not amount to knowledge.—Yours,

F. D. H.

Washington, July 4, 1889.

[We used the phrase somewhat loosely, without meaning to assert as an historic fact the occurrence in question. That our Puritan forefathers were in that "stage," we think cannot be questioned; and if burning had seemed to them as efficacious or convenient as hanging in the case of witches, they would not have been deterred by the cruelty of the punishment. On September 22, 1681, ten years before the witchcraft mania, two negroes were executed for arson in Boston—the man hanged, the woman (whose incendiarism had been attended with loss of life) burnt to death. As late as September 18, 1755, and in Cambridge, Mass., two other negroes were executed for poisoning their master—the man hanged, the woman burnt to death. (See Paige's 'History of Cambridge,' p. 217.) It would not be hazardous to affirm that not a decade passed from the date last mentioned to the outbreak of the civil war without one or more slave-burnings in some part of the country, North or South. The last which we happen to recall took place in Georgia in October, 1860. —Ed. Nation]

PHONETICS AND SPELLING REFORM.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Your correspondent, Mr. Mead, in the *Nation* of June 6, says, with regard to spelling, that "no inconsiderable obstacle in the way of reform is the inability to reach settled conclusions as to what sounds are in question." Is this really an obstacle? That practically phonetic methods of spelling are used in German and Italian would seem to indicate that, the reform once accomplished, there are no difficulties found on this account, for there can hardly be greater differences in the pronunciation of English than of these languages. Yet in these countries the children are, we may fairly say, saved years in education, and the problem of the mitigation of illiteracy is a very different one from what it is with us.

To a German or an Italian the alphabet represents the sounds used by him in his ordinary speech, and the question as to local differences in pronunciation is not necessarily raised at all, any more than it is with us by the methods of indicating pronunciation used in our standard dictionaries. These dictionaries, it would seem, form just the sort of standard of pronunciation necessary for a phonetic spelling. They do not tell us to pronounce a word as a native Londoner or New Yorker pronounces it, but tell us which of the (let us say) thirty-five sounds of our ordinary speech we shall use in uttering it. For example, let us say, "Pronounce the vowel of *yacht* as you do the o of *nŏt, ŏdd, resŏlve.*" It is true, the dictionaries differ somewhat, and some differences of spelling would result. But differences of spelling exist now, especially as between England and America, and cause no difficulties, so far as I know. Why should they any more than differences of pronunciation?

The advantages of a reform in the spelling would accrue chiefly to children and the illiterate, and to foreigners attempting to learn English, and these are classes not likely soon to be heard from on the question, so that the outlook, it would seem, is not promising, it not being a moral question, like the abolition of slavery. But do not let us raise difficulties that do not exist.

It seems strange that the Anglo-Saxon race, so far ahead of the rest of the world in some respects, and especially in most practical matters (even the Germans say, "Die Amerikaner sind so praktisch!"), yet allow the slow-going Continental nations to get ahead of them in such very practical things as spelling and the adoption of the metric system of weighing and measuring, as well as, in the case of England, the matter of a decimal currency. Shades of the Revolutionary Fathers! Can it be that a mild despotism that will force men to seek their best interests, has its advantages after all?—Respectfully,

R. M. Bell.

Berlin, June 24, 1889.

NEPOS FOR STUDENTS.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The subject of elementary education has been receiving more attention throughout this country for the past few years than ever before. Much has been done, and is still doing, to make the school course not a mere drill for the mental faculties, but a broadening and humanizing influence as well. It has become a recognized end to fill, no less than to discipline, the mind. In view of these facts, and of the general revisal of school text-books consequent upon them, it seems strange that an author so eminently fitted for the use of schools as Cornelius Nepos should be so generally passed over, both in public and private schools, in favor of the commonly prescribed first books of Cæsar and the four Catilinarians, through which pupils are usually given their first acquaintance with classic prose. In order to be able to read either Cæsar or Cicero with enjoyment or profit, a not inconsiderable acquaintance with the spirit of Roman life is necessary, besides a knowledge of dry technical terms. Neither of these drawbacks exists in the case of Nepos. Any one with a tyro's knowledge of Greek and Roman history may read his 'Lives' with pleasure, while his vocabulary is of universal application. A contemporary of Cicero, and thus belonging to the best period of Latin literature, he is remarkable for simplicity of style and construction. At the same time, he is full of happy turns of phrase that lend themselves to repetition almost as well as the incessantly quoted passages of the Eclogues. He is read in all the German gymnasia, and is one of the three authors cited by Matthew Arnold as read in the elementary English schools.

A final reason why it seems worth while to try to call the attention of educators in this country to Nepos as an author to whom it would be well to give school-children an introduction, is, that his 'Lives' are full of moral lessons. The boys and girls of this day and generation, when there is no time allotted to moral instruction proper in an ordinary school course, are especially in need of such concrete examples of great and noble deeds as the lives of the best and bravest men of antiquity can give them.

G. A.

Notes.

Mrs. Maud Howe Elliott and Mrs. Florence Howe Hall have undertaken to write a full account of the life and education of their father's deaf, dumb, and blind pupil, the late Laura D. Bridgman. They will be very glad to receive any letters, papers, etc., relating to the subject. All documents should be sent to Mrs. Hall, at Scotch Plains, New Jersey; she will carefully preserve and return them to the senders.

A new series of works in American history is announced by Charles Scribner's Sons, who suggest an analogy to the "Epochs of History" series. The division announced is into the epoch of discovery and colonization; the French and Indian wars and the Revolution; the adoption of the Federal Constitution; the anti-slavery conflict, the civil war, and reconstruction. The respective writers will be made known shortly.

Meanwhile, Messrs. Longmans, Green & Co. announce as in preparation "Epochs of American History" in three main divisions—'The Colonies (1492–1763),' by Reuben Gold Thwaites, Secretary of the Wisconsin State Historical Society; 'Formation of the Union (1763–1829),' by Dr. Albert Bushnell Hart, Assistant Professor of History at Harvard College, who is the editor in charge of the series; and 'Division and Re-union (1829-1889),' by Prof. Woodrow Wilson, of Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Charles L. Webster & Co. have in preparation, by Alfred R. Conkling, the 'Life and Letters of Roscoe Conkling,' and 'A Yankee at the Court of King Arthur,' by Mark Twain.

Ginn & Co. publish next month 'The Irregular Verbs of Attic Prose; their Forms, Prominent Meanings, and Important Compounds, together with Lists of Related Words and English Derivatives,' by Addison Hogue, Professor of Greek in the University of Mississippi.

The same publishers have just added to their "Classics for Children" series 'The Two Great Retreats of History' and 'Tom Brown at Rugby.' Xenophon's retreat and Napoleon's from Moscow, after Grote and the Comte de Ségur, are the two in question in the former volume. Both narratives are moderately annotated, and it would have been well if the foreign proper names used by the French author had been given an un-French form, on some consistent principle of transliteration. The attempt seems to have been made, but it is not successful. *Kowno*, *Borowsk*, *Twer*, *Dombrowna*, *Malojaroslavetz*, *Mojaisk*, *Louja*, are certain to be mispronounced by children (and by most adults, for that matter). *Rostopchin* may not prove a stumbling-block, but elsewhere we have *Tchitchakoff*. Though it is the fashion to praise 'Tom Brown' as a great aid in the formation of a manly character, we are not aware that it has been previously edited for schools, and by a woman. Clara Weaver Robinson does not name the "few passages . . . omitted from the original text, in the belief that it will thus be better adapted for the use of American schoolboys," but, by retaining the chapter on Tom's fight with "the Slogger," she has been reduced to the necessity of making a glossary of the slang of the prize-ring. Moreover, she preserves this choice vocabulary in an index to the notes.

Three volumes in the so-called "Student's Series of English Classics" are on our table. They are published in Boston by Leach, Shewell & Sanborn, and are all edited by members of the corps of female instructors at Wellesley College. Their aim is to assist in preparing for college examinations in accordance with the entrance requirements adopted by the Association of New England Colleges. The texts are Coleridge's "Ancient Mariner," Macaulay's Essay on Lord Clive, and Webster's Bunker Hill oration. The editing is on the whole commendable, but one smiles at the opening questions—"How much does the 'Ancient Mariner' mean? Is it true, as is ingeniously argued by a contributor to the *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* (July, 1880), that this poem embodies a complete system of Christian theology, presenting 'the Fall from the innocence of ignorance, from the immediacy of natural faith; and the return, through the mediation of sin and doubt, to conscious virtue and belief'?"

Another of those text-books intended for East Indian students is Messrs. Rowe and Webb's edition of 'Essays Written in the Intervals of Business,' by Arthur Helps (Macmillan). The notes are so often beneath the intelligence of any one whose vernacular is English, that they may be disregarded by those who would profit by the text itself. The mere republication is a good thing, whether one regards the author's style or his high morality.

We can further recommend to teachers, as an aid in English instruction, the 'Political Orations, from Wentworth to Macaulay,' edited by William Clark for the "Camelot Series" (London: Walter Scott). It contains specimens of Wentworth, Cromwell, Chatham, Burke, Grattan, Pitt, Erskine, Fox, O'Connell, and Macaulay, with proper introductions. We may as well mention here, too, the latest volumes of the "Carisbrooke Library," edited by Prof. Henry Morley (Geo. Routledge & Sons). One is 'The Earlier Life and the Chief Earlier Works of Daniel Defoe'; the other Gower's 'Confessio Amantis,' "popularized," with the accentuation marked.

Mr. G. H. Wilson, Boston, brings out in a sixth volume his 'Musical Year-book of the United States,' for the past season. It is a very useful record of programmes and performances and of much else besides, with an index to the compositions enumerated.

The July Bulletin of the Hatch Experiment Station of the Massachusetts Agricultural College has a timely application to household pests, from the Buffalo moth or carpet beetle to ants, with identification and suggested remedies.

A photographic illustration or two one now expects with each number of *Appalachia* (Boston: W. B. Clarke & Co.). The May issue has two views of Sierra Blanca, in the Rocky Mountains, accompanying a clever account of the partial ascent of that peak, by Mr. Charles E. Fay. Other papers are on the Alpine flora of Colorado and the glaciation of mountains in New England and New York.

The late Jules Barbey d'Aurevilly is commemorated at length by the friendly hand of M. Octave Uzanne in *Le Livre* for June, and an etched portrait of this "excentrique" and "Duc de Brunswick de la littérature" (in the popular estimation) is the solitary pictorial adornment of the number.

For the fourth time M. Jules Lemaitre, the most delightful of French critics, the most amusing, and not the least learned or the least acute, has gathered into a volume his scattered studies, which he still sends forth under the title of 'Les Contemporains: Études et Portraits Littéraires' (Paris: Lecène & Oudin; New York: F. W. Christern), although chief among the subjects of his criticism on the present occasion are Stendhal, Baudelaire, Mérimée, Lamartine, and George Sand. But, better than any of these, it seems to us, are the two papers in which M. Lemaitre analyzes the quality of Victor Hugo's poetry, and points out that the title of Thinker, with which the poet was prone to deck himself, is perhaps that to which he has least claim. The critic draws attention to the penury of ideas from which Hugo suffered, and to the extraordinary opulence and variety of the literary forms in which he could clothe the few ideas he had. The first of M. Lemaitre's papers was published while Hugo was yet alive, and it was perhaps the first note of the inevitable reaction against the excessive veneration of the author of the 'Misérables.' M. Lemaitre has also included in this volume the two essays on M. Daudet's 'L'Immortel' contributed to the *Débats* last summer.

Ibsen's "A Doll's House" and "Spectres" have just been translated into French, "La Maison de Poupée" and "Les Revenants," with a preface by M. Édouard Rod, the acute Swiss critic. M. Rod contributes a sober appreciation of Ibsen's dramatic works, which he esteems as highly as some more pervid admirers. The book is unfortunately disfigured by a repellent portrait of the Norwegian dramatist.

Refreshing it is to read about Goethe when a man of the late F. Th. Vischer's calibre has something to say about him. His son Robert has collected and recently published in 'Altes und Neues, Neue Folge' (Stuttgart: Bonz; New York: B. Westermann & Co.) Vischer's contributions to periodicals, speeches, and other minor essays, covering a wide range of subjects and the years 1847 to 1887. The fifty pages of "Kleine Beiträge zur Characteristik Goethe's" are worth five volumes of the *Goethe Jahrbuch*, the tenth volume of which has just been distributed to the members of the otherwise prosperous Goethe Society at Weimar. The aridity of the new volume keeps pace with its size. What a pity the old "Æsthetiker" could not have enlivened the pages of the *Jahrbuch* with some such *kleine Beiträge*.

The members of the Natural History Society in St. Petersburg have decided to publish a semi-monthly journal, after the form of the *Biologisches Centralblatt*, to meet the need for articles in Russian. Hitherto, two-thirds of the German zoölogical journals have been filled with Russian work, but the tendency is growing ever greater to publish in Russian and to found a national scientific literature and terminology. In connection with this, the management of the reports of current literature published at the Naples Station has refused to print in future, beginning with this year, any account of works issued in Russian, Polish, Hungarian, and "other barbarous tongues." Therefore, this new journal will contain reviews of Russian literature in all departments of biology, also of prominent foreign works, more general articles (but always of a strictly scientific character), and independent special contributions, which will form the foundation of the publication.

A volume recently published in Russia by the Geographical Society contains 676 songs, adapted to the various seasons of the year, and collected by Miss Zenaïde Radtchenko in the southernmost part of the Government of Mohilev, where it adjoins the Governments of Minsk and Tchernigoff. The locality is a curious one from the fact that the White Russians who inhabit it differ considerably from the general character of their tribe, both in their language, which has lost certain White-Russian peculiarities, in their customs, and in the contents of their songs, which reflect both Little and Great Russian. All these points are explained by the author in her introduction. A small collection of White-Russian proverbs is joined to it. She has furnished about 200 musical motives. Some of the songs have suffered from being influenced by the modern songs, the oldest being the most poetical and melodious; the modern songs—factory, soldier, and street songs—are vulgar in both words and air.

There are strong reasons for believing that Mr. Henry F. Waters has discovered the parentage of Roger Williams. The July number of the *New England Historical and Genealogical Register*, which has unavoidably been delayed, will contain the result of Mr. Waters's researches on this subject. The persons supposed to be his parents were residents of London, and not of Wales nor of Cornwall. The same number of the *Register* will contain two letters of Williams's, never before printed, written a few years before his coming to New England. He was then the private chaplain of a prominent Puritan family. It is probable that his early objections to the ceremonies prevented him from holding a living in England. He mentions having received the offer of two livings and a New England call.

—Dr. Mackay's 'Dictionary of Lowland Scotch' (Boston: Ticknor & Co.) was intended as a guide to Burns and Scott, but it grew upon his hands. There was room for such a work, and so far as definitions of words and illustration by quotations go, Dr. Mackay's book will fill it, but the unwary reader needs to be cautioned against following the author as an ety-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mological guide. We have to do with a genuine keltomaniac, who thinks that "philology is, at the best, but a blind and groping science," and who etymologizes as follows: "The true origin of the word 'Angles' is the Keltic or Gaelic *an*, the definite article, and *gaidheil* (in which the *dh* are not pronounced), which signifies the 'Gael,' or the *Celts;* whence *An-gael*, and not Angle." After that we are ready for anything, and we are not disappointed. The author affirms "that there is no real foundation for the confident statement that the name of 'Angles' was ever borne by or known to any German tribes"; that the epithet "'Anglo-Saxon' . . . was not known . . . until the second half of the eighteenth century"; and that "the southern English . . . are not half so much German as they think themselves," and more of the same sort. A little practical knowledge of the Northumbrian dialect and its descendant, the Northern dialect of Middle English, would have aided the author's etymologizing, for he perceives that "Scotch is for the most part Old English." An appendix on "Lost Scotch and English Preterites," which, too, must be read with caution, a "Collection of Scottish Proverbs," and a "List of Scottish Writers," complete the work.

—Our notice of Prof. Calvin Thomas's edition of Goethe's 'Tasso' (Boston: D. C. Heath & Co.) has been somewhat unreasonably delayed, but assuredly not for lack of appreciation, based on knowledge of its constant use for many months. It has proved itself highly serviceable. The text has been prepared with extreme care, important variants being given in Appendix ii. Appendix i is a brief but handy bibliography. The notes upon difficult passages are to the point and truly helpful—that is, they are not mere crutches to the halt and the lame. In some places we think the editor has been too chary of them, notably in the quarrel-scene between *Tasso* and *Antonio*. And in one or two instances we take exception to his interpretation. Thus we do not believe that in verse 39 Goethe is describing the blue haze of Sicily. The adjective *leisen* is rather to be construed as an adverb, *leise*, and the line is to be read: "The snow of the distant mountains is slowly melting" (more literally, evaporating). The note upon *wenn* (v. 444) should be cancelled, the word being used in its common sense of iteration, 'whenever.' The introduction is a careful discussion of the drama, its characters, and their relations to Goethe and his Weimar life. Nothing could be more scholarly in its tone and at the same time less dryasdust. One feels throughout that the editor reads his Goethe aright. At page xviii we think that "citizen class" would be better expressed by 'burgher' or *bourgeois*, and the assertion there made concerning Goethe's female friends ignores too bluntly Frl. v. Klettenberg and the Countess Stollberg, and the La Roche family. Besides, Lili's family scarcely rated themselves as Goethe's equals; they rather looked down upon him. Some few misprints (none serious) will be corrected, we are assured, in a second edition now in press. Would it not be better to set up verses 2,742-2,829 as scene 5? Schröer and the usual Cotta editions so treat it.

—In 'Hamersly's Complete Army and Navy Register,' 1888, as well as in a former edition, Fort Osage (p. 147) is described as "On the Missouri River, at the mouth of the Osage River in Jackson County, Missouri." This description is divided against itself, for the mouth of the Osage River is not at all in Jackson County, but forms the boundary between Osage and Cole Counties, and is removed from Jackson County by full half the vast breadth of Missouri. In 1811 Brackenridge (p. 217), though in a hurry, spent thirteen days in boating up the Missouri from the mouth of the Osage to Fort Osage. The post really took its name from the fact that the lodges of the Little Osage tribe, sixty in number, were within gunshot of the fort. On the day Brackenridge left Fort Osage he came within two leagues of the mouth of the Kansas River before encamping. Fort Osage was more than twice as far up the great river as the mouth of the Osage River. Its true position ought to be understood, or we shall underrate the distance in the far West to which our War Department early pushed an advanced post.

—We mentioned not long ago the "Billets du Matin," a series of short letters attributed to M. André Theuriet, one of which appears daily in the *Temps*. In a recent number M. Theuriet gives a curious and pretty Beauceron counting-out rhyme, which he says he remembers from his childhood:

"Lune, lune,
Coquelune,
Prête-moi tes souliers gris
Pour aller en Paradis,
Paradis il est si beau!
On y voit des p'tits jeannots.
"P'tit jeannot,
P'tit' jeannette,
C'est le temps de la violette,
Le Seigneur passant par là,
Il lui dit: Quoi qu'tu fais là?
Je garde mes p'tits moutons.
"Clin, clin!
C'est fait,
Va t'cacher dans ton p'tit coin!
Hirondelle,
Passez par la ruelle;
P'tit' souris,
Passez par ici."

Mr. Wm. Wells Newell, in his admirable 'Games and Songs of American Children,' quotes what seems to be a variant of this:

"Petite fille de Paris,
Prête-moi tes souliers gris,
Pour aller en Paradis.
Nous irons un à un,
Dans le chemin des Saints;
Deux à deux,
Sur le chemin des cieux."

—The recent execution in Paris of a soldier named Géomay, a miserable wretch who, for a few francs, murdered a woman who had been kind to him from his childhood, has opened again a question that was much discussed at the time of the execution of Prado, last December. Géomay, like Prado, had obtained a promise from the Abbé Faure, the much respected almoner of La Roquette, that his body should not be handed over to the surgeons for dissection. The Faculty of Medicine had a delegate, Dr. Poirier, in waiting at the cemetery, who claimed the body, but it was refused him by the Commissary of Police. Dr. Poirier did not insist upon his demand, out of regard, he says, for the Abbé Faure, who had given his word to Géomay, but he maintains earnestly that he has by precedent and in law a right to what he claimed, and that the Faculty of Medicine must assert this right in future, or else lose its best chance of solving some very important problems in pathology. The day after the execution of Prado Dr. Brouardel, the dean of the Faculty, expressed nearly the same opinion in an interview published in one of the daily newspapers, though he did not, as we remember, assert any prescription of law for what has hitherto been the general practice. Both doctors agree in regretting that considerations which are respectable but purely sentimental should stand in the way of what may possibly be most important scientific discoveries.

—It might, perhaps, appear to an inhabitant of Saturn that a body of men who had roused a fellow-mortal from sleep in the early morning, and had told him that in a few minutes they would kill him in recompense for his sins, and then had thrown him violently down upon a plank and cut his throat, and then had tumbled him, head and trunk, into a basket, and so sent him off at a smart trot to the cemetery, and, after this, had refused, out of a humane regard for his last wishes, to permit men of science to examine his body in the interests of the race—it might seem, we say, to a Saturnian that this last scruple was not well-timed. For why take the first step towards a dissection, and the only one that costs, by severing, not without some rudeness, the cervical vertebræ of a "subject," and then pause? And as to the subject's last wishes, doubtless one of them was that his body should not be dissected; but there was another and far stronger last wish of his that was completely disregarded—to wit, that he should not be killed. When one considers the comparative fervency of these two desires, not much can be said about the neglect of a dying wish. So a Saturnian might reason, for we could not expect an inhabitant of that dull planet to enter into the subtler thought and the more refined and delicate emotions of men.

HAYTI.

Hayti; or, The Black Republic. Second edition. Scribner & Welford.

When Sir Spenser St. John says that he has dwelt above forty years among colored people of various races, and is sensible of no prejudice of color, he reminds us of Nelson's protestation: "Thank God," said England's naval hero, "I have no prejudices, but I hate the French!" So with Sir Spenser St. John: he has no prejudice against black and colored people, but he hates the Haytians. When British Minister to Hayti, he appears to have manifested sympathy for a party in some of the numerous civil disturbances which occurred there from time to time. As a consequence, things were made somewhat hot for him when the chances of war turned against his party. In his own words (p. 113): "During the next three years I held a most difficult position. Having, by the action of our navy, expelled Salnave and his partisans from Cape Haïtien in 1865, they, on their return in 1867, treated me as their deadliest enemy." Smarting under the treatment he then received, Sir Spenser St. John did not wait for his enemy to write a book. He determined to write a book to show up his enemy. Let his readers compare the date of the genesis of the book as given by the author on page xvii of his introduction, with the date in the footnote above quoted, and they may find some explanation of the undoubted animus displayed in the book. Has anything appeared in any book or newspaper that is in disparagement of Hayti, the author inserts it in support of his prejudices. He even goes so far as to quote the dicta of those who have never been in Hayti. Thus, the exclamation of Napoleon III., "Haïti, Haïti, pays de barbares," does duty on the title-page, and reappears on page 187.

Perhaps the most ridiculous length to which the author has gone is to be found in his setting up of Mr. Froude as an authority upon Hayti. That distinguished novelist is, says the author, "a man of experience and observation, and not likely to allow a preconceived opinion to influence his judgment." Then follows the result of Mr. Froude's "inquiries as published in 1888," as to child-sacrifice and cannibalism being institutions of modern Hayti. The finding of that Quixotic littérateur is, *There is no room to doubt it.* On page 255 of 'The Black Republic,' Sir Spenser tells us: "Although I am not inclined in any way to shelter myself behind the authority of others, yet it is pleasant

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to find so eminent a man as Mr. Froude converted to one's views." Now, by Mr. Froude's own showing, he "did" Hayti by spending an hour ashore at Jacmel, and perhaps one or two hours at Port-au-Prince, and he harks back to the original authority. "I could not," he says, "expect that I, on a flying visit, could see deeper into the truth than Sir Spenser St. John has seen" ('English in the West Indies,' pp. 127, 128). Froude quotes St. John, and St. John quotes Froude, and that's how it's done, as the sleight-of-hand man says when he successfully performs the trick.

A common inaccuracy in historical reference distinguishes both writers. The very first sentence in the first chapter of 'The Black Republic' attributes to an English admiral and George III. the story of the crumpling of a sheet of paper by way of giving a presentment of the conformation of Hayti, which story is told of Columbus and Isabella with regard to Jamaica. Again, just as Mr. Froude, when on his jaunt to Jamaica, "declined to be taken over sugar mills," so, when, in 1873, a Haytian proprietor invited Sir Spenser St. John to spend a fortnight with him in the country, promising to show the enemy who was writing a book "all the superstitious practices of the negroes," did her Majesty's present Minister to Mexico throw away a golden opportunity. "I regret," he says, "I did not accept; at all events I should not have been called upon to witness a murder, and might have seen something new" (pp. 207, 208). Surely, Sir Spenser here writes himself down as fathering many statements about the superstitious practices of the Haytians of which he has had no personal observation.

Aware, as he tells us, that people are so little interested in Hayti that books fall flat "unless they amuse their readers by caricatures of the people" (p. 254), Sir Spenser St. John does not fail to treat his readers to any and every story that will tell against the Black Republic. Like most spiteful people, our author can be very amusing, and professional diners-out will find in his pages some droll and mirth-provoking anecdotes, told without any regard whatever for the feelings of others. In fact, it is clear that the ex-Minister to Hayti was far too superior a sort of person for the place where his lot was cast. His feelings were no doubt the same as those of his predecessor, Sir Charles Wyke, who had been heard to exclaim, "Confound Christopher Columbus! If he had not discovered America, I should not have been here." Both these ungrateful diplomatists seem to have overlooked the fact that, but for the discovery of Hayti, they might have lacked employment—for a while, at all events.

Sprung from a servile revolt, and cut off by the necessities of the case from the elevating influence of a civilized government in its midst, the birth of the Haytian nation was undoubtedly premature. With such a disadvantage at the outset, is it wonderful that the country should so often have been afflicted with civil war? As if, however, poor Hayti had not enough troubles of her own making, the attitude of France towards the little state has been one of bullying mastery. Sir Spenser St. John says (pp. 86, 87) that the French agents, even after the independence of the Republic had been recognized, affected to treat Hayti as a dependency until the debt exacted by France should have been paid. He adds, further on, that this heavy debt imposed on Hayti by France nearly sixty years ago has been the principal cause of the financial embarrassments of the Republic (p. 30). And yet, despite all our author's gloomy forebodings, if the financial condition of Hayti be taken as a standard to try her by, what do we find? On page 387 of 'The Black Republic' we observe the budget for 1885-1886. Its figures show current expenditure estimated at £670,743, and current revenue at £1,068,842. From the latter there is a deduction of £398,081 for "payments of instalments of differents." To those of us who had not entertained the idea that Hayti paid her debts, this large amount seems a highly creditable endeavor to wipe off old scores. Then, when we go into the detailed headings of the expenditure, we find that, of the gross sum of £670,743 required, no less than £116,356 is set down for public instruction, while £52,700 is asked for justice, and £11,275 for public worship. The other items are: foreign affairs £14,845, finance and commerce £86,804, war £182,689, interior £163,579, agriculture £42,495. Even in highly civilized countries a budget of this kind would be deemed respectable, and especially so where internal strife had for years been rife, although Sir Spenser believes the mass of the people cared little except for tranquillity (p. 113). Hayti will in time emerge from the stage in which public questions are fought out with the sword instead of, as with us, with the pen. A little country that has already produced a Boyer and a Geffrard is not without hope of giving birth to a statesman who shall in due course make his country an orderly and prosperous State.

As Sir Spenser St. John's fame is founded upon his "show-up" of Hayti, in 'The Black Republic,' let us now consider the very serious charges which he has formulated against the inhabitants with regard to human sacrifices and cannibalism. With regard to the practice of Vaudoux, pure and simple, that is to say, the superstitions of heathenism, there would be reason for surprise if this were not the case. It was from a seething mass of barbarism that the Haytian nation originally sprang, and, as our author states (p. 149), "there are still many negroes in Hayti who were born in Africa, being principally the remains of certain cargoes of slaves which English cruisers captured and landed among their free brethren." Then, as he tells us elsewhere, the Roman Catholic priests in many cases, up to the time of his going to serve in Hayti, were worse than useless. They led disreputable lives. In the country parts of the Republic the inhabitants are more or less heathen, with a slight veneer of Roman Catholicism. But Sir Spenser St. John tells the world that there has of late years been engrafted upon the original Vaudoux practices the horrible rite of human sacrifice. In substantiation of his statements, he gives extracts from newspapers, for the most part, and his authority for one case, which he describes with dramatic effect, was the Archbishop of Port-au-Prince, who told the story at his own dinner-table. The odd thing about the story is, that the young priest from whom the Archbishop had learned the details was seated at the same table, but, so far as the book shows, never an inquiry did the author address to him upon the subject. In support of his charge of cannibalism, Sir Spenser tells of divers mysterious cases founded upon hearsay evidence. He has, moreover, one clear case, for which eight persons were executed on the 13th of February, 1864. The hideous details of this case are fully set forth in the book (pp. 210 to 221). But all Americans are not desperadoes because there have been Chicago Anarchists; nor are Englishmen all fiends because there has been a Whitechapel murderer. The people of Hayti, as a body, are no doubt in a very low state of civilization; but, without more proof than Sir Spenser St. John has adduced, we cannot accept his charges of human sacrifices and cannibalism as of general application.

As to the very origin of the term Vaudoux he seems to be in utter ignorance, although his reading has taught him that on the African Coast the word takes the form of *Vodun*. He apparently does not know that the persecuted Vaudois or Waldenses, for whom Milton invoked God's help, and in whose behalf Cromwell spoke out, were, by their Roman Catholic oppressors, falsely accused of some of the horrible charges now imputed to the Haytians. It is from a slander upon those "who kept Thy Truth so pure of old," that the term Vaudoux was originally misapplied to heathen rites. In a Roman Catholic country such as Hayti ostensibly is, priests would, of course, use the word as a term of reproach where persons did not belong to their communion. On the other hand, those of us who have lived in Africa know how one hears of cannibals somewhere "far inland," but one does not ever meet such people one's self. You are told that in a far-off part of the country, when your neighbor hears that some one lies dying in your hut, he makes early application after this fashion: "You must trust us this time, and when next one of our family dies you shall have him to eat." The people who tell you these things wish to inspire you with dislike for those whom they thus defame. May not the religious paper in Hayti, called *La Vérité*, from which Sir Spenser so often quotes, be carried away by its very zeal?

A distinctive feature of our author's character is indulgence in innuendo. This is not confined to individuals, but is extended to the Government itself. For example (p. 231), it is suggested by him as probable that, acting in unison with the primitive Vaudoux worshippers, the Haytian Government might succeed in destroying the new seat of the Vaudoux who are charged with human sacrifices. And this is how he puts it: "The Haytian Government might be able to do much, *if ever they seriously desire it*, to put an end to the shedding of human blood." The whole world has recently had evidence of the active steps taken by the Haytian Government for the repatriation of those of its citizens who, by the cessation of labor upon the Panama Canal, have been left destitute. Does this show disregard for life? But diplomatists, like their professional rivals, should have good memories. In the single case of which Sir Spenser makes so much, which came into their courts—that for which eight persons were executed on the 13th of February, 1864—the Government caused the sentence to be carried out in spite of urgent appeals for a reprieve, and this by Sir Spenser's own showing (pp. 220, 221). For the rest, there is urgent need for reform in the Police and Prison Departments of the Haytian public service, and in other respects, and these we may hope for when the sword shall at length have triumphed on the right side, whichever that may be.

Sir Spenser St. John must not be taken seriously. He is not an inquirer, but a *gobemouche*. He mistakes gossip for evidence. He writes with a strong prejudice against the people of Hayti.

GARIBALDI'S MEMOIRS.

Autobiography of Giuseppe Garibaldi. Authorized translation by A. Werner, with a supplement by Jessie White Mario. London: Walter Smith & Innes. 1889. 3 vols. 8vo.

THROUGHOUT his eventful and romantic career, Garibaldi had years of comparative inaction,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at least as respects public life. If nothing better offered, as after the unsuccessful Italian revolution of 1848-9, he would work in a candle factory on Staten Island, or command the Columbian bark *Carmen* on a voyage to China, and back around Cape Horn with a cargo of copper to Boston; or, with the good American bark *Commonwealth*, carry a cargo of flour from Baltimore to London, and thence with English goods proceed to Mediterranean ports.

During those years he wrote the first part of his Memoirs, comprising his youth, his joining the Mazzinian uprising in Piedmont, his exile to South America, his ten years' guerrilla warfare in that country, and the prominent part he took in the Italian revolution of 1848-9. This he did not publish at the time; but, after the eventful epochs of the Franco-Italian war against Austria, the Sicilian uprising against the Bourbons of Naples led by him and his one thousand red-shirted volunteers, the Prusso-Italian war against Austria, and, finally, the Franco-Prussian war, which ended in the dethronement of Napoleon III., Garibaldi, on retiring to his island home of Caprera, corrected and modified the first portion, and wrote the remainder without books or documents, or any assistance save from his own memory.

"Naturally," as Mme. Mario justly observes, "he has fallen into sundry errors of dates and facts. He has also deliberately passed over entire periods of his life, thus omitting some particulars very interesting to the English reader as well as to his own countrymen. He, moreover, withdrew certain manuscripts which he at first destined for publication, containing some graphic accounts of events and some severe strictures on prominent men which he wrote from time to time, because, from his later point of view, 'the least said, soonest mended.' . . . Again, in one of his letters to Alberto Mario, who had requested to be allowed, in his 'Life of Garibaldi,' to publish some facts which the General himself had related concerning the King, he answers: 'I wish that nothing confidential between the King and myself should be published,' and in his Memoirs he publishes nothing."

We have quoted this passage from Mme. Mario's preface to indicate the reason for her own Supplement, which constitutes the largest volume of the three. This she has done as very few could have done better; for, by her connection, through her husband, with the most eminent patriots of Italy, and as a member of Garibaldi's army ambulance throughout the campaigns of 1860-66-67, and inspectress of ambulances in the French campaign of 1870, she speaks with the authority of an eye-witness. As we gave some account of the Autobiography on its first appearance in the original Italian, and as the translation before us is accurate and faithful, we will dwell rather on Mme. Mario's Supplement, and principally on her "Historical Introduction," which precedes the work.

In this monograph Mme. Mario has condensed the historical evolution of Italy for the last thousand years in the most lucid form, pointing out the true cause of her servitude and division. She objects to the term "rebirth" of Italy, and the way in which European nations hail her as their last-born sister.

"Arisen, rearisen, are the right terms for this seeming miracle," she says. "To say reborn would imply preceding death, whereas *what was death for other nations was only sleep for Italy.* . . . To assert that Mazzini or Garibaldi or Victor Emmanuel 'created' Italy by their separate or united genius, prowess, and ambition, would presuppose her non-existence; would assign to one man or to three men the merit of an entire people of heroes and of martyrs, of thinkers and of doers—a people which had never ceased to be, but which, owing to intrinsic and extrinsic reasons, had refrained from merging their separate existences in one collective whole."

The above is the keynote to this most interesting study. The Italian people, and not one man, or three men, reawakened the new Italy. But to one alone of this trio—Mazzini—is due the credit of first *seeing* the true means of this reawakening in forgetting the old mediæval notion of a universal Roman Empire, and fusing the severed members of the Italian people into one. The Italian people, who, with the Roman Republic, had organized a grand system of government; with the Imperial power had permeated Europe with their institutions and laws; with the free communes of the Middle Ages had destroyed feudalism and created literature and art; and, leaping over the heads of religious reformers like Luther or Calvin, had alighted on the fountain-head of modern reason and science with Giordano Bruno and Galileo, nevertheless forbore to solve the problem of their own nationality by reason of the fundamental idea underlying centuries of their existence: the universal sway of the Roman Empire. This phantom supremacy, held up by the genius of Dante, was, down to the sixteenth century, the fixed ideal of every patriotic Italian.

When the Visigoths in the fifth century founded monarchy in Spain, Clovis laid the basis of it in France, and a heptarchy was instituted in England, the brave and wise Theodoric made himself master of all Italy. But he was only esteemed and obeyed as long as he stood in the character of general and viceregent of the Emperors Zeno and Anastatius. After his death, the Italians sided with the treacherous Greeks under Belisarius and Narses rather than with the monarchy of the Goths, under the idea that they were faithful to the Roman Empire. This ruling passion was still more apparent during the sway of the Longobards (568-773), "who," as Machiavelli states, "after two hundred and thirty years of Italian existence, retained nothing of foreigners but the name." But the Popes, fearing lest the Italianized Teutons should found with the Italians a free, strong, and united nation, instigated these latter against them; summoned first a new barbarian, Charles Martel, then Pepin, then Charlemagne, who finally defeated Desiderius, the last of twelve Italian-born kings, and was crowned by Leo III. Emperor of the Romans. Charlemagne paid him back by creating, for the first time, a Pope-King, by confirming all the territorial donations of Pepin, and adding many more to the patrimony of St. Peter, "and the Romans, seeing that a Roman Pope had crowned an Emperor in Rome, indulging in their dream of empire, never for a moment guessed that they had sacrificed the substance for a shadow—a Roman Italy, based on a popular constitution, for a visionary imperial sceptre which they were destined nevermore to wield."

For the next two hundred and fifty years and more there followed that confused kaleidoscope of Frank and German emperors, popes and anti-popes, kings of Italy, marquises, counts, and barons warring against each other, till the crown of Italy was adjudged to Conrad the Salic in the diet of Mayence. The Milanese and Pavians refused to accept him, but Pope John crowned him Emperor in Rome. Conrad besieged Milan, and the Milanese for the first time mounted their sacred *carroccio* to repel him, and instituted the Communal Government, the parent of the free communes of Italy, which for the next five hundred years stood out prominent in the path of liberty, culture, and art, ending with the Renaissance, and with the most glorious of those communal republics, the city of Florence. An emperor and a pope combined together, Charles V. and Clement VII., extinguished this last bulwark of liberty in 1530.

What a history is comprised in those eight hundred years! Hildebrand the monk, who, as Pope Gregory VII., with the assistance of Countess Matilda, brought the German Emperor Henry IV., in sackcloth and ashes, to his feet in the fortress of Canossa, was the first Pope who conceived the revival of the universal Roman Empire under the Christian religion. From that period Italy was divided into the two factions which assumed afterwards the names of Guelph and Ghibelline, partisans of the Pope or of the Emperor—yet with the old Roman phantom of universal empire under either of them. The free communes waged war against the feudal barons, razed their castles, forced them to live within the cities, disfranchised them so that a nobleman could neither vote nor hold public office, but they seldom demolished the Emperor's castles or refused allegiance to the Empire. Each commune, each city, quarrelled and fought for its own liberty, rights, and privileges; but when they could not settle their disputes, they called in the "natural umpire," the Emperor. When Frederick Barbarossa, profiting by their discords, descended into Italy to impose his despotic rule, the communes bound themselves together in defence of their rights and utterly defeated him at Legnano, May 29, 1176; yet in all their mutual treaties of defence and offence they employed the formula, *saving always fealty to the Empire.* They rebelled against the abuses of the Emperor, not against the rights of the Holy Roman Empire.

This fixed idea of empire was more solemnly vitalized by Dante in the fourteenth century. Dante is rightly styled the father of the Italian language, the first philosopher of the Italian people, the greatest poet of Christianity; but in politics he was an imperialist. A bitter adversary of Pope Boniface VIII., because he affected a supremacy over emperors, kings, and communes, the idea of *one* Italy never dawned on his mind, except as she was comprised in the unity of Christendom. In his famous book 'De Monarchia,' he says:

"As the Empire signifies the dominion of the Roman people over the earth, so the majesty of the Roman people is personified in the Emperor, to whatever country it may belong. The garden of the earth is Italy, not Germany, whence the Roman Emperor must extend his sceptre over all monarchies and over all peoples, thus transforming the world into a Christian republic, of which all states are members, the kingdom of France even as the smallest Italian commune."

And he worked for this shadow of empire when Henry of Luxembourg, that ghost of a Roman Emperor, descended into Italy, advising him to assert his imperial rights, "which are bounded neither by Italy, nor by Europe—which ought hardly to be limited by the waves of the ocean."

Petrarch dreamed of Italian States at peace among themselves, and encouraged Cola di Rienzo in his attempt of restoring the Roman republic—the old Roman dream, not the new Italy. When the last spark of Italian free communal life was extinguished at Florence, Italy, for the following 300 years, seemed dormant or dead. But if she appeared thus politically, she was not so intellectually. The intellectual history of Italy for those 300 years has not yet been written. We have studies, monographs, lives, written in England, France, Germany, and, since the accomplishment of Italian liberation, in Italy (for before that time no such work would have been allowed to be published);

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but a philosophical and scientific history of this intellectual ferment we have not. Giordano Bruno, whose monument has just been unveiled at Rome on the same Campo de' Fiori where he was burned at the stake, and his contemporary Galileo would alone shine as the pioneers of free thought and scientific research; and, following them, what a long list of intellectual luminaries.

Coming nearer to our own day, Mme. Mario notes:

"In 1791, about the time that the guillotine was invented in France, Galvani discovered galvanism, and Volta published his memoir on the electric pile, just as the troops of the French Directory invaded Savoy and Nice. Little doubt have we that Italy would have worked out her own salvation earlier and with less of suffering had she been left to her own devices. The Americans had sealed independence with their blood at Lexington in 1775, constituted their thirteen colonies into the United States in 1776, formulated their Constitution in 1787, proclaimed the rights of man to freedom and equality; yet still the world persists in attributing the rise of modern liberty, progress, and of democratic principles to France!"

During the Napoleonic rule the same Roman imperial ideals still predominated in Italy. Was not Napoleon an Italian, and of the oldest Italian race, of Etruscan extraction? And was he not crowned Emperor of the Romans? And all Italy fell down at his feet, even after the treachery of Campo Formio, when, with a stroke of his pen, he erased from the political map of the world the thousand-years-old republic of Venice, and handed her, bound hand and foot, to Austria. When Napoleon fell, had all the Italian States confederated their forces, they might have held their own; but this idea never occurred to them, and Europe settled their destinies according to the separate interests of the allied Powers, by parcelling out Italy into ten heterogeneous puny principalities.

It was only after so many centuries of disillusion that Mazzini first evoked the idea of Italy for the Italians united in one, which for two generations had thousands of victims and martyrs; and, when the last lingering phantom of the old imperial power was dispelled by Napoleon III. arresting the victorious French and Italian armies at Villafranca, this Mazzinian idea became universal among the Italian people, was fully and boldly taken up by the "King of the Alps," and brought Italy victorious to her freedom and independence.

Space will not allow us to comment on Mme. Mario's Supplement itself, except to say that it completes Garibaldi's Autobiography; and, as it is based on original documents in her special care, or draws from official records or personal testimony, is therefore the most thorough and authoritative addition to Garibaldi's memoirs that has yet been published, and a vast mine of wealth for the future historian of Italy.

The first volume is adorned with a portrait of Garibaldi in photo-aquatint, which is the best and most natural likeness we have ever seen of him.

The Story of William and Lucy Smith. Edited by George S. Merriam. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1889.

An American clergyman and man of letters, Mr. Merriam has written the life of an English man of letters and his wife, and he has done it excellently well. The reader will be sure to wonder why it was not done before; why some one of the many near to them as relatives or friends did not assume the task. But the delay was fortunate which found its term in Mr. Merriam's gravitation to the business for which he has proved himself eminently fit. Drawn to it by love and admiration, through acquaintance with the writings of William Smith and some correspondence with Lucy after her husband's death, he had placed in his hands a mass of varied material from which he has worked out a consistent whole. It will very likely be objected to his book that it is too long (666 pp.); that it introduces us into too close an intimacy with the joys and sorrows of the two Smiths; that he has given us too much of his own comment on the course of spiritual events which he displays. But there will very certainly be many who will agree with us that, even if these objections are valid, they still leave the book abundantly delightful and impressive.

But are they valid? Only in part. There is too much of personal detail. Mr. Merriam would have us know with what plain living the high thinking of these people went along—that a great sorrow did not prevent the wife from simple happiness in household cares; he would have us see the wholeness of her life; and these things he has accomplished, but they might have been accomplished with a less expense of the details of domesticity and intercourse with relatives and friends. As for the intimacies disclosed, Mr. Merriam has not exceeded much, if any, the limits of Lucy Smith's memoir of her husband, printed at first for an inner circle, but afterwards published with a group of his essays and with his novel 'Gravenhurst.' It may be that she offended, but we have had so many revelations of domestic infelicity that it would seem as if we were entitled now and then to a revelation of domestic happiness, of love stronger than death. As for Mr. Merriam's commentary on the course of spiritual events, it is justified by the motive with which it is made and by its intrinsic character. To a remarkable degree the tendencies of religious thought and feeling of their time were reflected in the lives of William and Lucy Smith. It has been Mr. Merriam's object to draw out the lesson of their lives, and make it helpful for those who are under stress of spiritual weather; to connect it with tendencies of thought which have become dominant since William Smith laid down his busy pen.

There have been so many Smiths that it would not be strange if the name William Smith conveyed no distinct idea to the majority of our readers. He was born in 1808 and died in 1872. His best known works are 'Thorndale' and 'Gravenhurst,' in which he threw into conversational form a discussion of philosophical and religious matters. They are hardly to be ranked as novels. The characters are personifications of different tendencies of the writer's own thought. Dropping the form of fiction altogether, he wrote a 'Discourse on the Ethics of the School of Paley,' and 'Essays on Knowing and Feeling.' Of all these writings Mr. Merriam gives a careful analysis, which will send many to the original matter. What was most remarkable in William Smith was an extremely spiritual interpretation of doctrines which are commonly supposed to lean to the unspiritual side. He anticipated many evolutionist ideas, but we find ourselves continually regretting that he never brought the full force of his thought to bear on the general scheme of evolution. A fine meditative quality was his most excellent gift. It would seem as if no one could read him, or about him, without finding in him a kind of English Amiel. Like Amiel, he published poems—two or three dramas among them, one of which Macready produced in 1842—but they had the dulness of Wordsworth without his sudden gleams of satisfying thought and glorious expression. Where Amiel published but two or three essays, William Smith published nearly or quite one hundred, for he held from 1839 until his death a connection with *Blackwood's Magazine*, and the most important books of a whole generation furnished the subjects upon which he wrote.

In his early manhood he was intimate with the younger Mill, John Sterling, Lewes and Maurice, and was not the least of them in the promise of an active public life. But "the spell of the desk" grew on him steadily, and at length he drew apart from all society for a life of meditative thought. The first product of his seclusion was 'Thorndale'; the next was a happy marriage with Lucy Caroline Cumming, who had come with her mother to spend the summer in Borrowdale, where he had taken refuge from the world. The best part of Mr. Merriam's book is from this point onward. For material he had Mrs. Smith's Memoir of her husband, her manuscript account of the love-making and engagement, his journals and her letters to many friends, with their testimonies to her worth. He was about fifty, she nearly forty when they met. If she was not intellectually his equal, she was a woman of no mean abilities or acquirements. She was a successful author, and a diligent translator of French and German books. Her translations of Freytag's 'Debit and Credit' and Grillparzer's 'Sappho' are well known. The marriage was delayed two years by reason of pecuniary straits. The quality of the man is indicated by his refusal to do a piece of translation which would have made the marriage possible, because there seemed to be a certain dishonesty in translating, and so making more accessible, writings which were discordant with his own ideas.

For eleven years William and Lucy Smith lived together in a union of singularly perfect happiness, their love enduring in the higher love of all great realities and fair ideals. Before he knew her he had written:

> "Our best beliefs from best affections spring,
> And solitude is ignorance."

And this prophecy he now made good. In 'Gravenhurst,' which he wrote after meeting her, the tone is distinctly more genial and hopeful than in 'Thorndale.' But the spell of the desk was not broken. Her society was all he asked, and what larger intercourse there was came from her gentle violence with him, responding to the claims of many friends.

It is with his death in 1872 that we enter on the most impressive phase of her experience. She survived him ten years, living in constant spiritual communion with him. There was no narrowing of her life, but rather much broadening. She drew to her many noble friends. She was a diligent reader of the best books, especially of those which bore upon the subjects which had engrossed her husband's interest, and upon the problems of theism and a future life. She entered more deeply into her husband's mind when he was gone than she had done when he was living. She attained to firmer confidence than his in immortality. She had never reacted from evangelicism so violently as her husband, and was helped until the last by the faith of those whose reasons for their faith she was obliged to put away. At the same time she was singularly brave in her encounter with such thought as was most hostile to the hopes and longings of her heart. She was incapable of wilful self-deceit. On the one hand, we find her in correspondence with President Porter of Yale College, and on the other with George Eliot. We have had no side glimpses of the latter more delightful and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

assuring than those which are afforded here. Her sympathy with a faith and hope to which she could not personally hold was very beautiful.

We cannot imagine any better book than this for those who have suffered grievous loss, especially if for them the dogmatic tenure is no longer possible. Even the most dogmatic may be led to wonder if their dead certainty is any better than a living hope. Those who cannot permit themselves so much as this will find themselves encouraged by the spectacle of a real spiritual communion of soul with soul. A photograph of a bust of William Smith answers completely to the mental image of modesty and delicacy and refinement which the book in general conveys. It is a pity that we have not the wife's picture also. Her late marriage was from no lack of beauty. We are told that she was very beautiful from youth to age, and that she had many noble lovers. The homeliest face informed with such a soul as hers must have been beautiful at last.

"*War with Crime*": Being a selection of reprinted papers on crime, reformatories, etc., by the late T. Barwick Ll. Baker, Esq. Edited by Herbert Philips and Edmund Verney. Longmans, Green & Co. 1889.

THE editors of these papers are justified in their selection of a title by the fact that Mr. Baker himself employed it as a heading for one of his essays, but we could wish that they had chosen differently. There is a suggestion of sentimentalism in it that is unfortunate; for, while Mr. Baker was the soul of kindliness, his feelings did not escape from the control of his reason, and his methods were rigidly scientific. He had a prolonged and thorough acquaintance with criminals, and he had learned by experience to judge of the motives by which they are influenced. Hence he was always ready to defend his theories by referring to facts that had come within his own observation, and, indeed, his theories were for the most part derived from his own experience. We would not be understood as claiming for these papers any perfection of form, but they are capital examples of that common sense which is after all the sublimation of reasoning, and which has given their wonderful success to the political institutions of the English people. We cannot do better than quote, as showing Mr. Baker's grasp of the subjects with which he dealt, and as illustrating the manner in which such subjects ought to be dealt with, some passages from one of his papers on Adult Reformatories:

"I imagine that it will be generally allowed that the time for simple retributive justice—that is, for considering that a man is to expiate his offence by suffering a proportionate amount of punishment—is past, with the days of mammoths. I think it will be allowed that our object now is not to spite a man for what he has done, but to prevent him and others from doing the like again. This includes the two principles—deterrence or prevention, and reformation.

"I place first the deterrence or prevention, because I consider it as applying to by far the largest number, and therefore to be of more importance. Reformation appeals to thousands who have been detected in crime; prevention to the millions who have not. I am no opponent of the deterrent system. I believe that if it be shown that a punishment inflicted on a criminal will, by its severity, prevent others from crime, we are justified to any degree in which the present evil of the severity is balanced by the benefit of prevention.

"But, we must remember that punishing a man by no means implies doing him or wishing him harm; and a punishment may be highly deterrent, and yet in the end beneficial. Our object should be then the greatest possible deterrence with the least ultimate harm to the offender; or, if we can manage it, even the greatest good we can give to the offender without the loss of the deterrence."

These sentences contain the philosophical basis of modern penology. They seem axiomatic, but those who are acquainted with the history of legislation affecting criminals know with what difficulty public sentiment has been educated to their reception, and to what constant attacks they are even yet exposed at the hands of benevolent as well as malevolent persons. Did our space permit, we should be glad to quote Mr. Baker's own statement of the measures by which these principles are most effectively reduced to practice. The system which he advocated for many years, with line upon line and precept upon precept, and which has been to a considerable extent adopted in Great Britain, is in its main features as follows: In general, a first offence should be punished by a very short sentence, perhaps not more than ten days' imprisonment, but the prisoner's fare should be only bread and water. Experience shows that under this treatment more than four-fifths of the offenders are not again convicted. For a second offence the punishment should be materially increased, six or twelve months, or the reformatory, with police supervision after release. For a third offence there should be penal servitude for six or seven years, and for a fourth, in most cases, penal servitude for life. In this way the class of old and hardened offenders, the dread of the honest and the corrupters of the weak, is broken up. Gangs of skilful thieves cannot maintain themselves as they do when sentences are not regulated by the previous history of the convict.

Upon the subject of police supervision of discharged criminals Mr. Baker's observations are conclusive. It has been urged, and the theory has been adopted in practice, that when a man has been discharged on a "ticket of leave," the police ought not to look after him. From a sentiment of pity it has been urged that these men ought not to be hindered in their attempts to earn honest livings by having their antecedents disclosed. That is to say, if the police see that a skilled burglar has, on his discharge from prison, obtained, very likely by a false character, a situation as butler, they ought to allow the employer to remain in ignorance of the history of the custodian of his plate, rather than disclose what might cause a poor man to lose his situation. The fraudulent character of this philanthropy is clearly exposed by Mr. Baker, and he clinches his argument by facts which show that there is no practical difficulty in obtaining work for men known to be discharged convicts. Of the many other advantages of a system of supervision we can make no mention.

During the most of his life Mr. Baker was the manager of a reformatory which he established on his own estate. We learn little of this from his own papers, but it is known to have been steadily successful. In 1856 these reformatories came generally into use in England, and the practice was adopted of sending to them nearly every boy who was convicted for any but a first offence. In that year about 14,000 girls and boys were committed to prison, but in four years the number was reduced to 8,000, and in 1882 it seems to have been only 5,700. In fact, these papers show clearly how effective rational principles of treatment have been in England in reducing all grades of crime. Incidentally they show how much good work has been accomplished in a quiet way by a class of men much abused in these democratic days, the justices of the quarter sessions. Many of these gentlemen have devoted themselves to the management of reformatories with as much zeal and at as much expense as wealthy Americans display over their stock-farms. The former have improved the breed of men, the latter the breed of horses. Some of Mr. Baker's illustrations show, also, how ignorant is much of the newspaper criticism of the sentences imposed by these gentlemen.

There is a great deal of repetition in these papers, but it is not tedious repetition. We incline to think that those who are unfamiliar with these subjects will find the reiteration of the principles involved an advantage, and we heartily commend the book to all who feel that they have some individual responsibility in the matter of the general duty which it is admitted society owes to its feebler members. While this collection of papers is not properly a memoir of Mr. Baker, it yet gives some idea of the noble life which he led, and is a much more impressive monument than most biographies. It well deserves an index; the table of contents, although classified, is inadequate.

Historic and Picturesque Savannah. By Adelaide Wilson, illustrated by Georgia Weymouth. Boston Photogravure Co. 1889. 4to, pp. 258.

THE open squares of Savannah, interspersed at regular and frequent intervals, originally designed as places of refuge for the outlying population in frontier war, have become beautiful parks and breathing-places, which, with the abundant foliage of the streets themselves, quite justify the title of Forest City sometimes given to the subject of the work before us. But it is less the topography of the wooded, sandy bluff, with the yellow river in front, the swamps in rear, and the not distant sounds and bays of ocean, that make it interesting, than its inheritance of character and its relics of those who gave it character. As Georgia was the youngest colony, so Savannah has a pre-Revolutionary history of barely forty years; but Oglethorpe and Whitefield lived for it, and Pulaski and Jasper died for it, all leaving their impress. Oglethorpe, soldier and philanthropist, established the colony (and for a long time the colony centred on the town), partly as a haven for those under civil oppression and partly as a bulwark against the Spaniards. Both ends were successfully attained, and the Savannah of to-day in its inhabitants and its institutions displays its early strain. The people are martial, given to hospitality, and abounding with benevolent institutions.

The makers of this book have collected curious and interesting material, much of which will probably surprise all but well-informed local antiquarians, although in the nature of the case there is a great deal of no value other than that which age imparts to any incident. General readers will take the most interest in Bethesda, the orphan home established by Whitefield in 1740, and nourished by the well-known Countess of Huntingdon; in the effort to make Georgia literally to flow with oil and wine, and especially to force it into a silk-growing community; in Oglethorpe's generous diplomacy with the aborigines and skilful strategy against the Spaniards; in the influence of three wars; and in the singular incidents by which the graves of Gen. Greene, who died near the town, and of Count Pulaski and Sergeant Jasper, who fell before it, remain undetermined, although in Pulaski's case, it is true, the probabilities point to his body having been secured.

No book prepared especially for the popular taste can be expected to be minutely accurate, either as to things said or left unsaid, but there

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are in this certain odd omissions. For instance, we can find no mention of the ornate Confederate monument south of Forsyth Park. The peculiar organization and management of the police force, modelled upon that of regular troops, does not appear; the very excellent colored military companies are ignored, although much space is given to their white comrades. In that archaic period "before the war," smoking was forbidden in the streets of Savannah. A similar ordinance in Boston formerly led to much derision from the presumed Puritanical instincts it was supposed to indicate, but Savannah was never thus held up to scorn. Whether in consequence of that compulsory education or not, it was long a mark of the resident, as distinguished from the transient citizens, for men of whatever degree to remove their cigars, any lady approaching. So gracious a custom deserved commemoration. There were no public schools in Savannah until 1866. "During slavery" a free colored woman, by energy, frugality, and toil, had amassed a little fortune. It was unlawful to educate those of her own color, and she left her earnings to establish a free school for poor white children—the first within the city. Such pathetic bounty reflects glory on all her kind. Now, excellent public schools for both races flourish. Within a very few weeks a disastrous fire has swept the town, and the Independent Presbyterian Church, on Bull Street, figured and described in these pages, for seventy years an architectural ornament of distinction and a treasury of tender association, went down before it. So suddenly does what is become what has been.

The only error of fact that we have noted is a curious one of derivation, affecting the base-word itself. Savannah traces a distinct etymological ancestry through the Spanish *sabana* and the Latin *sabanum* to the Greek σάβανον, and therefore we can hardly join in the enthusiasm with which the author (p. 4) "rejoices that Savannah River and Savannah town are left to tell their tale of Indian origin down the long line of centuries to come." This is like the grave explanation offered last summer on an Atlantic steamer by a clergyman imported from the mother country, that Pulaski (Tenn.), which came up in conversation, was named for an old Indian chief who used to live there! The index appears copious, but is exasperatingly disappointing. A book of this kind, whose whole value depends upon its accumulation of details, should have a carefully prepared and carefully arranged index, and the one is not always the other. This is neither. The table of contents is better.

Essays, Chiefly Literary and Ethical. By Aubrey de Vere, LL.D. Macmillan & Co. 1889.

THIS supplementary volume of Aubrey de Vere's Essays is less striking than those "chiefly in poetry" which we recently noticed, partly because the topics are less important in the literary criticisms, and partly because the tone is controversial in the political and religious division. Archbishop Trench's poems are carefully considered, and a justly favorable decision is reached, though without due acknowledgment of the secondary and imitative quality of his secular verse; Coventry Patmore and Sir Samuel Ferguson's Irish epics are the only other reviews, and the literary pieces include besides these only a lecture upon the Social Aspect of Literature, principally directed to those who might regard literature as an encroachment upon religion or a rival to it, and some remarks upon Wordsworth which we have elsewhere referred to in connection with the Wordsworth Society. The larger part of the volume is occupied with discussions of Irish policy and church disestablishment, and with argumentative rather than suggestive papers upon science and religion, and the inadequacy of the Bible, as interpreted by private judgment, to afford a rule of faith that can equal in authority and validity that derived from the church. Mr. de Vere writes upon these topics with earnestness and fervor, with an interest in them perhaps deeper than his interest in literature; but he appeals to a narrower audience, and the points in dispute are such that agreement upon them is not to be expected. The author's temper, it is needless to say, is admirable.

The Petrine Claims: A Critical Inquiry. By Richard Frederick Littledale, L.L.D., D.C.L., etc., etc. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; New York: E. & J. B. Young & Co. 1889.

DR. LITTLEDALE is a man of very considerable learning, of much wit, and of a versatility that is little short of wonderful. He has written abundantly during the last thirty years in a range that extends from the editing of Greek Office Books to the reviewing of new novels in the *Academy*. He is in every way comparable, except perhaps as poet, with his friend the late Dr. John Mason Neale, and yet somehow—one does not know exactly why—he has never had Dr. Neale's *auctoritas* as a writer, nor his *gravitas*. Perhaps the reason is that he has been so often a controversialist and an advocate. His present volume shows both his strength and his weakness. It is an extremely clever argument to show that, under the rules of the Canon Law to which Roman Catholic controversialists appeal, the Papacy has no case at all; that there never has been a devolution of the Petrine Privilege in the See of Rome; and that, if there had been, it would have been long ago entirely annulled and voided by demonstrable and incurable flaws, so that no valid Pope has sat for more than four centuries, and none can now be created.

This is certainly sweeping enough, and is in a way amusing, just as Prof. Huxley's little scuffle with Mr. Lilly, or Mr. Mivart, about the teaching of Suarez was. But it will convert nobody—not even the youngest cardinal. For, whatever men may say, nobody really cares twopence now about the Canon Law. The appeal lies rather to what Cardinal Newman has called "the logic of visible facts." Dr. Littledale's book is, nevertheless, dedicated by permission to Bishop Stubbs of Oxford.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Arnold, Sir E. In My Lady's Praise: Poems Old and New, written to the honor of Fanny Lady Arnold. London: Trübner & Co.; Boston: Roberts Bros.
Daudet, A. Les Femmes d'Artistes. Paris: A. Lemerre: New York: Westermann. $1.25.
Dickinson, C. M. The Children, and Other Verses. Cassell & Co. $1.
Grove, Sir G. Dictionary of Music and Musicians. Appendix. Macmillan & Co. $2.25.
Hale, Rev. E. E. Sunday-School Stories on the Golden Texts of the International Lessons of 1889. Boston: Roberts Bros.
Sauveur, L. Les Chansons de Béranger. F. W. Christern.
Steele, Rev. G. M. Outlines of Bible Study: A Four-Years Course for Schools and Colleges. Leach, Shewell & Sanborn.
The Two Great Retreats of History. Boston: Ginn & Co. 60 cents.
Valera, J. Cartas Americanas. Primera serie. Madrid: Fuentas & Capdeville; New York: Brentano.
Ignoles, O. J. Life of Charles Blacker Vignoles: A Reminiscence of Railway History. Longmans, Green & Co. $5.
Walford, L. B. A Sage of Sixteen. Henry Holt & Co. $1.
Wallace, A. R. Darwinism: An Exposition of the Theory of Natural Selection. Illustrated. Macmillan & Co. $1.75.
Wallace, J. Carpet-Bag Rule in Florida. Jacksonville: Da Costa Printing and Publishing House. $1.50.
Walworth, Jeannette H. A Splendid Egotist: A Novel. Belford, Clarke & Co.
Ward, W. William George Ward and the Oxford Movement. Macmillan & Co. $4.
Warman's Physical Training; or, The Care of the Body. A. G. Spalding & Bros. 25 cents.
Whitney, Prof. W. D. The Century Dictionary: An Encyclopedic Lexicon of the English Language. In 6 vols. Vol. I. Parts I-IV. The Century Co.
Wilder, M. P. The People I've Smiled With. Cassell & Co. $1.50.

"Every child in America should have them."—*New England Journal of Education.*

"The 'Young Folks' Cyclopædia' should be in every juvenile library."—*From a Report of the Connecticut Board of Education.*

YOUNG FOLKS' CYCLOPÆDIA of { *Common Things...$2.50.* / *Persons and Places.$2.50*

HENRY HOLT & CO., Publishers, New York.

DAVID G. FRANCIS,
17 ASTOR PLACE, NEW YORK,
DEALER IN VALUABLE OLD AND NEW
BOOKS.
Priced Catalogues issued from time to time, sent gratis to any address.

F. W. CHRISTERN,
254 Fifth Avenue, between 28th and 29th Sts., New York.
Importer of Foreign Books, Agent for the leading Paris Publishers, Tauchnitz's British Authors, Teubner's Greek and Latin Classics. Catalogues of stock mailed on demand. A large assortment always on hand, and new books received from Paris and Leipzig as soon as issued.

DO YOU READ YOUR BIBLE with a copy of A. Schultze's (Pres't Moravian Theolog. Sem'y) THE BOOKS OF THE BIBLE ANALYZED? Just published. Send 20c. at once for it. THE BOOK ANTIQUARY, Easton, Pa.

WANTED.
$100,000
In sums of $500 and upward, to loan on improved Denver real estate, at
8 PER CENT.
PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST GUARANTEED.
Denver real estate nets an average of 25 PER CENT. per annum. Maps and information free.
Refer to Union Bank, German National Bank, State National Bank of Denver, Col., Chemical National Bank, and National Park Bank of New York.
MOORE & ERMERINS,
1626 Champa St., Denver, Col.,
239 Broadway, New York.

Letters of Credit. We buy and sell Bills of Exchange on and make cable transfers of money to Europe, Australia, and the West Indies, also make Collections and issue Commercial and Travelling credits, available in all parts of the world.
Brown Brothers & Co., Bankers,
NO. 59 WALL STREET, NEW YORK.

S. DAVIS, JR.'S
CINCINNATI
Diamond Hams.
For 48 years this brand has given satisfaction for the evenness and richness of its curing. Sold by leading Grocers, from whom obtain circulars "How to Cook the Diamond Ham."

TECHNOLOGY
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW.
Published in the interest of a higher standard of Architectural Education in America. Issued from the
DEPARTMENT OF ARCHITECTURE,
Massachusetts Institute of Technology,
BOSTON, MASS.
Subscription, $3.00. Particulars upon application.

NEW CATALOGUE of Books in good condition now ready. Books purchased.
E. W. JOHNSON, 1336 Broadway.

BACK NUMBERS, VOLS. AND SETS of the *Nation* bought, sold, and exchanged.
A. S. CLARK, 34 Park Row, New York City.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED